

**No Barrier for Melbourne Grove South**

**1. Objections and concerns of local residents**

1.1 Residents in surrounding streets (Melbourne Grove North, Chesterfield, Ashbourne, Tell, Matham, Bassano, Blackwater, Lytcott, Playfield Crescent, and Colwell) do not wish Melbourne Grove South to be blocked with a permanent barrier.

1.2 225 people have signed a petition to Southwark Council stating:

"NO BARRIER FOR MELBOURNE GROVE

We the undersigned don't want Melbourne Grove South blocked off by a barrier. We want joined-up thinking to make all our roads safer for everyone.

We want the whole community - young and old, drivers, pedestrians and cyclists - to be able to use our streets easily and safely. As residents we want the emergency services to have rapid access to our roads when we need their help.

We believe the best way to get safer shared streets for everyone is to call on Southwark Council to produce a comprehensive traffic management study to include all roads in the Grove Vale/Lordship Lane, East Dulwich Grove, Townley Road Triangle."

A further 33 people have signed as supporters.

1.3 Please see Appendix 1 for the Change.Org petition comments and signatures. Please see attachments for paper petition signatories.

1.4 Melbourne Traffic Action claim to have undertaken consultation with local residents, we believe that this claim was not investigated thoroughly at the meeting held on 24 June 2015. No attempt has been made by Melbourne Traffic Action to meaningfully engage with other locally impacted residents. In the Ashbourne Grove Survey conducted in July 2015, 91.3% of respondents were not contacted in person to discuss the traffic issues on Melbourne Grove South.

1.5 When the Melbourne Grove Traffic Action request to immediately close Melbourne Grove was unsuccessful in June 2015, they proceeded to request a number of temporary closures over the next three months – Saturday 5<sup>th</sup> September, 3<sup>rd</sup> October and 7<sup>th</sup> November from 12-2pm. Once again residents were informed via a letter after the application was made and granted by Southwark Council.

Recommendation:

- 1a) The Dulwich Community Council (DCC) reverse its decision to allocate £10,000 on a feasibility study for a permanent barrier.
- 1b) DCC commission a traffic management study to include all roads in the Grove Vale/Lordship Lane, East Dulwich Grove, Townley Road Triangle.

## 2 Evidence and Governance

2.1 Statistics show no significant change in traffic volume or speed in the last five years. See below:

Traffic volumes and Speed for Melbourne Grove 2009<sup>1</sup>

Direction	Av. All Vehicles/day	Av. Speed	85th Percentile Speed
Northbound	908	18.2	22.4
Southbound	1127	17.9	21.7

2015 (two week Traffic Survey from April 11-24, 2015)<sup>2</sup>

Direction	Av. All Vehicles/day	Av. Speed	85th Percentile Speed
Northbound	Approx. 1,000	19mph	=<25mph
Southbound	Approx. 1,000	18mph	=<25mph

85% of the traffic does not go faster than 25mph, which is technically not high enough to issue a speeding ticket. 15% of traffic was going at 26mph or higher, but highest speed is unspecified in the report. <sup>2</sup>

Independent Survey 2014<sup>3</sup>

Parameters	Sample	Average Speed	Proportion exceeding limit	Proportion exceeding limit by more than 5 mph
Built-up roads in Great Britain with a 30mph speed limit	55,918	30mph	45%	15%

15% of vehicles speed on Melbourne Grove, equal to the same amount of vehicles which speed on comparable built-up roads in Great Britain.

2.2 The introduction of Southwark Council's 20mph campaign on all roads/streets was only completed on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2015. The Traffic Survey was completed in April when the new system had just been implemented.

- 2.3 The council's own professional officers have been ignored, Appendix 2.  
Extracts below:
- a) 'currently Melbourne Grove *does not record as a priority*'
  - b) 'Officers would not recommend *any form of restricted entry or closure on the public highway* unless there were special circumstances. Any such proposal needs detailed consideration given the likely *impact on the wider highway network.*'
- 2.4 Only 2 reported collision in the last three years, 2 slight casualties. To quote 'Bobby P' on the East Dulwich Forum –“There was one crash recently (which I witnessed) at the corner of Ashbourne/Melbourne, involving a motorbike, but *nothing to do with speeding*, rather a turning car not seeing the bike.”
- 2.5 Numerous residents have seen and reported random examples of dangerous driving, however this is open to subjective interpretation and should not be used to make key decisions with wide ranging financial and community impacts.
- 2.6 There is direct evidence that Ashbourne Grove and Melbourne Grove South are used in the cases of emergency diversions. On 8 August, Police instigated a diversion due to a serious accident on Lordship Lane which blocked traffic in both directions. Photo's attached in Appendix 3.
- 2.7 The original deputation from Melbourne Grove Traffic Action, failed to:
- a) provide clarity on the wishes of Melbourne Grove residents, the original deputation was signed by only six people and sheets paper with signatures attached – no specific details on what people signed.
  - b) consult locally impacted residents, a majority of residents received a letter only two days prior to 24 June 2015 meeting.

### Recommendations:

- 2a) for interested residents and Councillors to be trained in how to measure speeding, interpret relevant traffic data etc.
- 2b) Councillors to be made aware of the council's governance around petitions, decision making, giving due weight to the guidance of council officer's etc.

### 3. Funding allocation and distribution

- 3.1 At the meeting on 24 June, “£5,000 to £10,000” was awarded from the Cleaner, Greener, Safer (CGS) fund for a feasibility study on the Melbourne Grove South permanent barrier.

We believe this allocation is an inappropriate use of CGS funding, for the following reasons:

- a) according to its own guidelines, CGS funding projects should make Dulwich a better place to live and projects must make a permanent, physical improvement. The barrier proposal has split the local community as there are polar views on whether this measure would make Dulwich a better place to live. No other project on the current CGS list could reasonably be considered so divisive.
  - b) a barrier placement clearly constitutes a significant traffic management measure for which Southwark has an established process, including feasibility studies. Sponsoring Traffic Management Orders (TMO) with CGS funds may be regarded as an attempt to circumnavigate the rigour of the existing TMO process, particularly in light of the Officers Report. Piecemeal traffic schemes such as this will inevitably fall outside, and even work against, the overall traffic strategy for the area.
- 3.2 The vast majority of CGS projects do not sponsor Traffic Management Orders.

#### Recommendation:

- 3a) CGS funding only be allocated to projects on Melbourne Grove South which will lead to permanent, physical improvements which benefit a majority of the wider community.

#### Footnotes:

1. Spreadsheet: [[www.southwark.gov.uk](http://www.southwark.gov.uk)] and Web page: [[www.southwark.gov.uk](http://www.southwark.gov.uk)]
2. The Traffic Survey from April 11-24, 2015, which measured the speeds on Melbourne Grove, was done by a consultant called Applied Traffic [[www.appliedtraffic.co.uk](http://www.appliedtraffic.co.uk)].
3. (From Table SPE0102 at [www.gov.uk/government/statistics/free-flow-vehicle-speeds-in-great-britain-2014](http://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/free-flow-vehicle-speeds-in-great-britain-2014)). The attached time series and time-of-day graph are from some of the other tables. The contents page for more related PDF reports and Excel datasheets is at [www.gov.uk/government/collections/speeds-statistics](http://www.gov.uk/government/collections/speeds-statistics).

## Appendix 1 – Comments and Petition (<https://goo.gl/raKx58>) Signatures

---

Comments as at 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2015 10pm.

Name	Postal Code	Signed On	Comment
Resident	SE22 8SW	17/08/2015	We need to work together to manage traffic across the whole of the local area, particularly with new schools opening in the coming years.
Resident	SE22 8RN	18/08/2015	I was not consulted prior to this being raised and I wonder who's interest this is in and why so secretive. I am worried about emergency service access and having to use Lordship Lane to exit when needing to journey via East Dulwich Road. Ashbourne grove would take most of the cars and angry drivers unable to pass through Melbourne and we already have the problem of people leaving Lordship lane when stuck in a line of traffic and tearing up here to get out of traffic. I fear for our children and animals and we have already had several cats mown down by speeding drivers. I do not believe this to be in the interest of all residents, just a few people with their own agenda.
Resident	SE22 8RN	18/08/2015	As a resident of Ashbourne Grove I have concerns about the knock on effect on my road.
Resident	SE22 9LB	18/08/2015	This is a public road which I walk along 2 times a day and have never witnessed any issues, blocking it would make public transport on an already slow Lordship Lane slower.
Resident	SE22	19/08/2015	I don't want to be forced around a crowded high street and slow and busy roundabouts just to get to the junction at the top of my road
Resident	SE22 8PN	19/08/2015	I don't want traffic which can no longer access Lordship Lane this way to be displaced into Matham Grove

Resident	SE22 8RL	19/08/2015	I'm worried a manufactured consensus is being created to benefit a small number of people while not actually solving anything for the rest of us.
Resident	SE22 8RN	20/08/2015	I have not witnessed traffic concerns that would justify blocking Melbourne Grove and displacing the resulting traffic onto the neighboring roads. This would not improve the neighborhood and rather would create new safety issues on a number of other roads.
Resident	SE21 7JA	20/08/2015	There is no more justification for closing MG to traffic than any other street in this part of Southwark
Resident	SE21 7JP	21/08/2015	The free running of traffic in built up areas is necessary for all residents
Resident	SE220JP	21/08/2015	I am worried about how this 'problem' has been identified, the precedent it sets for other streets who may well want the same and the apparent lack of strategic oversight.
Resident	2072	22/08/2015	This is a most disappointing proposal. For Chesterfield Grove residents and others the cure is far worse than the problem.
Resident	SE17 3LX	23/08/2015	My son lives on Ashbourne Grove and I constantly access his street through Melbourne Grove. I would not like to see what would be increased traffic down the street my son lives on.
Resident	SE23 3PH	24/08/2015	Barriers will cause annoyance, confusion and force more traffic down the already congested main roads, slowing us all down and having repercussions further up the south circular and beyond - especially in the mornings- I think everyone should be free to use side roads, why should those living on the roads the council thinks the traffic should be going down instead suffer worse delays than there are already due to extra volume of traffic and crossings just to make other roads quieter!
Resident	SE22 8UN	25/08/2015	A barrier would be a drastic solution with unpredictable knock-on impacts. A wider traffic management study is needed to inform plans for overall traffic flows and calming measures for the area as a whole.

Resident	SE21 7EE	25/08/2015	This proposal doesn't seem to have been thought through, particularly the knock on impact on surrounding streets
Resident	SE22 8UT	25/08/2015	more traffic calming would be fine, but traffic blocking is NOT good here. every part of Melbourne Grove is used in one way or another by local circulation. Any barrier anywhere is going to make more traffic congestion elsewhere but particularly Lordship Lane - which has more than enough already.
Resident	SE22 8rl	25/08/2015	it is a ridiculous idea and will be a danger to the local community
Resident	SE22 8LY	26/08/2015	I'm signing because blocking Melbourne grove will only push traffic into lordship lane or other routes and make traffic jams that already exist even worse, to the detriment of residents there and lose business for local shopowners. Absolute waste of money, you should be embarrassed to spend our money on rubbish ideas like this.
Resident	SE218LW	26/08/2015	I agree with all points of the petition.
Resident	SE22 8RL	26/08/2015	The barrier will cause more traffic jams in the surrounding roads. Many drivers may not be aware of the barriers and have to reverse or turn back which will create more chaos and inconvenience to local residents, car users or not. There would definitely be more angry drivers on the scene and Ashbourne Grove would take most of the heat. I also don't want any deterioration of property values due to such dreary traffic management scheme.
Resident	Se22 8rh	26/08/2015	I'm worried about the knock on effect of traffic and parking in the roads around Melbourne Grove. Also want the emergency services to be able to access our streets quickly if necessary. Unsure how this fits in with traffic management in ED as a whole. Seems like a drastic solution to benefit a very small but vocal number of people. I don't feel like there's been proper consultation at all.

Resident	SE21 8JD	26/08/2015	I visit a friend regularly on Melbourne Grove. Too much traffic is already directed onto an already congested Lordship Lane
Resident	SE22 8PN	27/08/2015	This would be likely to result in more traffic down Matham Grove and other nearby roads. Insofar as there is a problem, a more comprehensive plan for the local area is needed.
Resident	SE22 8SS	31/08/2015	Any change in the flow of traffic in Melbourne Grove will greatly affect the quiet roads leading to Dulwich Village, both Docercourt Road and Beauval Road will be turned into cut through roads, there would be an increase in speeding traffic. We have 2 young children, and cats and already my car has been bumped and wing mirrors knocked by speeding vehicles since the junction of Townley road has been closed.
Resident	SE21 7JB	31/08/2015	As a local resident I think it's a bad idea and will just displace traffic onto other roads
Resident	SE22 8RW	31/08/2015	This will drastically alter traffic flow through residential areas leading to rat runs and concentrating traffic inappropriately on residential streets
Resident	SE22 8RL	01/09/2015	There was no consultation with local residents that could be affected by this proposal. I believe that it will have a detrimental affect on traffic in the surrounding streets, particularly Ashbourne Grove. Melbourne Grove is a very important secondary route for traffic (including emergency vehicles) in the event there is an accident on Lordship Lane.
Resident	Melbourne Grove	01/09/2015	This has not been thought through and is a complete waste of council resources. Without reviewing the whole traffic system and reviewing the impact of 2 new schools opening at either end of the "proposed" closure all this will do is move the traffic to neighbouring residential streets.
Resident	E4 9AY	02/09/2015	It will cause more traffic
Resident	SE22 0HX	02/09/2015	Any changes to traffic in east Dulwich should be made with consideration to all traffic in the area, not one street in isolation.



Resident	SE22 0AU	02/09/2015	This has not been thought through
Resident	SE22 0QY	02/09/2015	All it does is push the problem onto other nearby roads
Resident	SE5 8DH	02/09/2015	I am signing because I believe that the proposal will divert traffic from a gentrifying area onto roads which are predominantly surrounded by council owned accommodation. The proposed road closure does not appear to be fair and a more comprehensive plan needs to be reached for the entire area.

**Please note: further information on signatories available on request.**

## **Appendix 2 – Councillor’s Briefing Note**

---

Melbourne Grove – Briefing for Ward Councillors

The perception of speed and volumes of traffic on Melbourne Grove is causing concern to local residents. Officers have received a petition, and a number of follow up emails, and a deputation is to be made at Dulwich Community Council on Weds 24 June. This note has been prepared for all ward councillors to inform them of the options available. The issue impacts on both East Dulwich and College wards since the ward boundary runs down Melbourne Grove.

The area of road that is causing concern runs from East Dulwich Grove to Lordship Lane. There is no controlled parking zone in operation. In recent past the Council has introduced the borough wide 20MPH limit. The road has a series of speed cushions along the full length.

The request from the residents was originally to have existing speed cushions removed and replaced by speed humps. An additional/alternative request is for the introduction of some form of filtered permeability (closure) on Melbourne Grove between Tell Grove and Ashbourne Grove.

Officers have previously advised that there is no funding currently available to make further changes to Melbourne Grove. This is because the majority of Southwark’s funding for improvements on the public highway comes from Transport for London. There is limited funding each year and therefore a prioritisation of those funds is applied. The highest priority goes to locations with clusters of road traffic accidents or schemes that deliver wider transport objectives such as implementation of cycle facilities. Currently Melbourne Grove does not record as a priority. The Council is committed to reducing road traffic casualties and the introduction of speed reduction measures has been a contributory factor towards the Mayor of London’s mandatory performance targets.

It also should be noted that TfL issued this guidance in respect to the use of funding:

“Road humps: given the Mayor’s position on these, boroughs should exhaust all other options before considering the use of vertical deflections such as road humps and speed cushions. If a borough considers such measures to be the only viable option then a further discussion may be needed with TfL on their acceptability.”

Officers would not recommend any form of restricted entry or closure on the public highway unless there were special circumstances. Any such proposal needs detailed consideration given the likely impact on the wider highway network.

### Current Situation

1. Review of road for speed and volumes - these were surveyed as part of the Council's recent implementation of borough-wide 20 MPH . Data collected in February 2015 shows an average speed of 20 MPH and approx. 1000 vehicles per day in each direction. A further speed survey was undertaken by met Police in April 2015 and recorded a mean speed of 18.5mph

Recorded road traffic accidents – 2 reported collisions in last 3 years, 2 slight casualties.

Officers are committed to undertaking further counts in 2016 as part of our post-implementation 20mph review programme. However, given the data currently available, Melbourne Grove is unlikely to be a high priority for action in the near future.

2. In the interim, to improve road safety for all users officers propose to introduce

double yellow lines at all the junctions on Melbourne Grove to improve sight lines. Recent observations noted a significant level of parking very close to junctions. This is in contravention of the Highway Code - Waiting and parking (242) DO NOT stop or park: "opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space.". Double Yellow lines will be introduced, subject to consultation, to clarify where it is appropriate to park.

In regard to the investigation of new yellow lines, we will assess this during June/July 2015 and, assuming approval by the community council, works could begin in December 2015. Read about how and when we assess Quarter 2 local parking amendment items.

Should you require an update on the progress of the item, please contact the investigating officer [michael.herd@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:michael.herd@southwark.gov.uk)

Future Options

3. Given the issue is not likely to be a corporate priority for some time, one funding option that could be investigated is using Cleaner Greener Safer funding. Applications for next year will be considered in the autumn. Some approximate costs to consider:

Feasibility study to investigate road closure - £5-10k

Introduction of road closure - £20-30k

Replacement of one set of cushions with full width sinusoidal hump - £3-5k

Officers' view is that replacement of sets of cushions with new full width humps is not likely to have a significant impact on vehicle speeds.

4. Transport for London have just re-launched Community Roadwatch - working in partnership with the Metropolitan Police Service and City of London Police to run Community Roadwatch - a road safety initiative which aims to reduce speeding in residential areas.

Community Roadwatch will give local residents the opportunity to work side by side with their local police teams, and use speed detection equipment to identify speeding vehicles in their communities. Warning letters will be issued where appropriate, and the information captured may help to inform the future activity of local police teams.

Community Roadwatch is being rolled out across London in phases, with a commitment to reach all London boroughs by December 2015. For further information about the initiative, please contact

[CommunityRoadwatch@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:CommunityRoadwatch@tfl.gov.uk)

Matthew Hill

Public Realm Programme Manager