

<b>Item No.</b> 14.2	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 15 July 2015	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Camberwell Community Council
<b>Report title:</b>		Local traffic and parking amendments	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		South Camberwell	
<b>From:</b>		Public Realm Programme Manager	

## 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 consultation and procedures:
  - St Francis Road – install double yellow lines adjacent to existing vehicle crossovers and two turning heads to improve access.
  - Grove Lane adjacent to 153 and 155 – remove existing double yellow lines and extend existing permit holders (L) parking bay to improve permit parking availability for residents.
  - Grove Lane adjacent to 201 – remove existing permit holders (L) parking bay to accommodate new trees.

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

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **St Francis Road**

6. The parking design team was contacted by a local resident with concerns that vehicles are parking in locations that obstruct access to off-street parking and within the turning head at the south-western end of St Francis Road.
7. St Francis Road is situated off Dog Kennel Hill / Grove Vale (A2216). It is not located within a parking zone but has short lengths of double yellow lines, a disabled parking bay and a 30 minute short stay bay near the junction with Dog Kennel Hill.
8. The road is a cul-de-sac and has a purpose-built turning head at its south-western extremity which has been designed to allow vehicles to turn around and exit the street in a forward direction.
9. The road is predominantly residential but has retail units at the junction with Dog Kennel Hill. It is located close to East Dulwich rail station and five bus routes pass along Dog Kennel Hill.
10. An officer carried out a site visit, 6 May 2015, to assess the concerns raised and to consider if adjustments to parking were necessary. It was noted that vehicles were parked opposite the off-street parking areas and within the turning heads.
11. The parking occupancy was high in the street and vehicles were parked on both sides of the carriageway. A continuous line of parking means that making a three-point turn is difficult and most vehicles, especially larger (eg. delivery / refuse) will need to make use of the turning head. If parking occurs within the turning head then it cannot operate as designed and vehicles may be forced to reverse for an unsafe distance and possibly back out into Grove Vale.
12. During the visit it was also noted that a vehicle parked off-street, adjacent to No.53, was parked at an angle taking up two spaces. The officer felt this was as a result of the vehicles parking on the carriageway.
13. It is recommended, as shown in Appendix 1, that double yellow lines are installed to prevent parking in the turning heads and to improve access to the off-street parking spaces.

### **Grove Lane adjacent to 153 and 155**

14. The parking design team was contacted by Councillor Barber on behalf of a resident and enquired if a length of double yellow line could be removed and replaced by a permit holders (L) parking bay.
15. An officer carried out a site visit on the 8th May 2015 to assess the situation and to determine if the request could be met.
16. The restrictions have been in place for over six years and the council does not hold a record of the reason for the existing yellow lines. It is assumed that they were provided as a "loading gap" which was a historic design approach that has now been superseded by this and most authorities, particularly in residential areas where loading is allowed in a parking bay.

17. It is recommended, as shown in Appendix 2, that double yellow lines are removed and the existing permit holders (L) bay is extended by 10 metres, approximately 2 car spaces, to provide additional resident parking availability.

### **Grove Lane adjacent to 201**

18. The property 201 Grove Lane is the subject of an insurance claim that has been going on for nearly 2 years caused by two London plane trees located to the front of the property. As a result of the damage to 201 Grove Lane it has been determined that the trees must be removed. The trees form an integral part of the street scene and therefore there is a desire to replace them to maintain the Victorian Avenue feel. This is at the request of local residents who have been displeased about the removal of the mature trees. .
19. It will not be acceptable to plant small replacement trees and as such large semi mature specimens have been sourced. Recognising the current issue of damage to 201 Grove Lane and to ensure the risk of this reoccurring is minimised the trees will need to be relocated further from the property. It therefore proposed to replant these trees in buildouts within the carriageway (currently parking bays) with a sufficient pit size. The proposal is to delete 6 six bays to provide a planting area to accommodate two new semi mature trees.
20. Officers understand from residents during a site meeting attended by Cllr Peter John, that the general opinion (certainly of those who have fought to retain trees and the home owner of 201 Grove Lane) is that the loss of parking is acceptable to ensure the longevity of planting of the Victorian Avenue for Grove Lane.
21. In addition to the damage caused to the property, the trees also restrict the access along the footpath down to a minimum 0.5m. It had been previously proposed that the loss of parking would be required to provide a build out for the safe passage of the public along the footway at this location as this is far below required minimum accessibility standards.
22. In view of the above, it is recommended that, as shown in appendix 3, the permit (L) parking bay south-east of the boundary of 199 and 201 Grove Lane is revoked to enable the above footway and tree works and replaced with no waiting at any time restrictions (double yellow lines) alongside the new 'build-out'.

### **Policy implications**

23. 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**

24. The policies within the transport plan are upheld within this report have been subject to an equality impact assessment.

25. 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.
26. 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.
27. 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.
28. 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**

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

#### **Legal implications**

30. Traffic Management Orders would be made under powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984.
31. 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.
32. 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.
33. 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.
34. 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.
35. 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**

36. Where public or stakeholder consultation has already been completed, this is described within the key issues section of the report.
37. 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.
38. 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:
- publication of a proposal notice in a local newspaper (Southwark News)
  - publication of a proposal notice in the London Gazette
  - display of notices in roads affected by the orders
  - consultation with statutory authorities
  - 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
  - a 21 day consultation period during which time any person may comment upon or object to the proposed order
39. 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.
40. 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**

41. If these items are approved by the community council they will progressed in line with the below, approximate timeframe:
- Traffic orders (statutory consultation) – July to August 2015
  - Implementation – September to October 2015

## Background Documents

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Transport Plan 2011  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>	Southwark Council Environment and Leisure Public Realm projects Parking design 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Tim Walker 020 7525 2021

## APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	St Francis Road – install double yellow lines
Appendix 2	Grove Lane – extend existing permit holders only bay nr 153 155
Appendix 3	Grove Lane – remove existing permit holders only spaces nr 201

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Matthew Hill, Public Realm Programme Manager		
<b>Report Author</b>	Tim Walker, Senior Project Engineer		
<b>Version</b>	Final		
<b>Dated</b>	2 July 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>			2 July 2015