

Item No. 14.	Classification: Open	Date: 17 October 2015	Meeting Name: Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Community Council
Report title:		Canada Water and Southwark Park parking project	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		Rotherhithe and Surrey Docks	
From:		Public Realm Programme Manager	

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Community Council comment upon the following recommendations that are due to be made to the cabinet member for environment and the public realm:

Canada Water parking project

- a. Approve the extension of the existing Rotherhithe (H) parking zone to the following streets, subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory procedures:
 - Albion Street (between Swan Road and Canon Beck Road)
 - Canada Street
 - Canon Beck Road (south of Brunel Road)
 - Gomm Road
 - Quebec Way
- b. Approve the position and type of parking bays and restrictions for the new parking layout as shown in the detailed design (Appendix C).

Southwark Park car parks

- c. Approve the parking layout and the introduction of a 4 hour maximum time limit on all general parking spaces to encourage turnover in space for genuine park users (Appendix D).

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. The strategic parking project programme was approved by the Head of Public Realm in conjunction with the cabinet member in September 2014. This programme included a consultation on a proposed parking zone in the Canada Water area.
3. Following approval of the programme but in advance of public consultation, a report was presented to Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Community Council on 23 March 2015. This report set out the proposed consultation methods and boundaries for the Canada Water parking project and Southwark park car park.
4. At the meeting, the community council asked that Canada Street and Quebec

Way be included within the scope of the parking project as these streets were often full of commuter vehicles.

5. As a result of the changes requested by the community council, the consultation boundary was amended to include Canada Street and Quebec Way.
6. In accordance with Part 3D paragraph 22 of the Southwark constitution the decision to implement a new strategic transport scheme lies with the cabinet member for environment and public realm.
7. Part 3H paragraph 18 and 20 of the constitution sets out that community councils are to be consulted on the detail of strategic parking / traffic / safety schemes. In practice this is carried out following informal public consultation.
8. The community council is now being consulted on the recommendations that are due to be presented to the cabinet member, following informal public consultation.
9. The project area is not geographically connected and is divided into 3 areas. These 3 areas are located of the periphery of the existing Rotherhithe (H) parking zone, which was first introduced in 1998. Since its implementation, the zone hasn't expanded.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Canada Water parking project - consultation findings

10. Full details of the consultation strategy, results, analysis and options can be found in the "Canada Water consultation report" (Appendix A) but the key issues are summarised in this section.
11. Informal public consultation took place with all residents and businesses within the project area from 29 May 2015 until 19 June 2015.
12. The informal public consultation yielded 737 returned questionnaires from within the consultation area, representing a 10% response rate which is relatively low for this type of consultation.
13. Figure 1 details the overall response to the headline questions.

Response rate	Do you want a parking zone to be introduced in your street?	If a parking zone was introduced, which of the following <u>hours</u> would you like the parking zone to operate?	If a parking zone was introduced, which of the following <u>days</u> would you like the parking zone to operate?
10%	36% - Yes 53% - No 8% - Undecided 3% - Not answered	38% - 8.30am to 6.30pm 34% - Other specified 18% - 12 noon to 2pm 8% - 10am to 12 noon 3% - 10am to 2pm	49% - Monday to Friday 21% - Monday to Saturday 30% - Other specified

Figure 1

14. The majority (53%) of respondents, across the entire project area, are not in favour of the introduction of a parking zone in their street.

15. Street by street analysis (Appendix B) shows that opinions about parking and the actual level of parking stress¹ do vary from street to street in the project area and this has informed the recommended options in the section below.

Proposed options

16. Having considered all the data available, four possible options are considered feasible. The rationale, risks and benefits for each of the options are discussed in the consultation report and summarised in figure 2.

Proposed options	Rationale
<p>OPTION 1 Introduce a parking zone in Area 1 - Gomm Road only (excluding Ann Moss Way, Culling Road, Hothfield Place and Orange Place).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 67% of respondents are in support of a parking zone • The majority of respondents indicated that they experience difficulty parking, Monday – Friday during the daytime • The weekday parking stress surveys indicated a very high average parking occupancy (120%)
<p>OPTION 2 Introduce a parking zone in Area 2 - Canon Beck Road (south of Brunel Road) and Albion Street (between Swan Road and Canon Beck Road).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% of respondents are in support of a parking zone. • The majority of respondents indicated that they experience difficulty parking, Monday – Friday during the daytime • The weekday parking stress surveys indicated a very high average parking occupancy (92%) • Swan Road is already within the existing Rotherhithe (H) parking zone. However there is a block of flats (Pine House) which is situated between Swan Road and Canon Beck Road and fronts Albion Street. This section of Albion Street is uncontrolled and should be included in any proposed CPZ.
<p>OPTION 3 Introduce a parking zone in area 3 - Canada Street, Roberts Close and Quebec Way (excluding Wolfe crescent and Saunders House).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No representation was received from the 6 postal address on Canada Street (Saunders House) or the 3 postal addresses on Quebec Way (a school and 2 business premises) • The weekday parking stress surveys indicated a very high average parking occupancy in Canada Street (113%) and Quebec Way (92%) • It is anticipated that the parking pressure will only increase further once the housing development in the area is completed.
<p>OPTION 4 Not introduce a parking zone anywhere in the project area but introduce junction protection (double yellow lines) at all junctions to prevent obstructive or inconsiderate parking.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 53% of the overall feedback are opposed the scheme. • Parking zones can be unpopular in some areas with commonly expressed concerns including the cost of the permits and displacement of parking to adjacent areas, resulting in “creep” of parking zones.
<p>OPTION 5 To introduce a parking zone to all roads within the entire project area (Areas 1, 2 and 3).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several housing and commercial projects have been approved for development the area. • The parking stress surveys in the project area indicated most roads are experiencing high levels of parking stress that could be reduced by the use of a parking zone to remove commuter parking.

Figure 2

17. It is officers' recommendation to proceed with options 1, 2 and 3 for the reasons explained in figure 2.
18. Any new parking zone would be an extension of the existing Rotherhithe (H) parking zone, which currently operates Monday – Friday, 8.00am – 6.30pm.
19. Consultees were asked whether they would change their mind if a parking zone were to be introduced in a neighbouring street. No streets in the project area indicated a change in opinion.
20. If a parking zone were to be introduced (as detailed in Options 1, 2 and 3), it is likely that parking activity will be displaced to the roads in the area excluded from the parking zone. This will increase parking stress in those roads and may result in pressure for a further consultation in the excluded roads after the implementation of such a parking zone.

Southwark Park car park

Background

21. 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 car park off Hawkstone Road.
22. The aim of the project is to improve the parking facilities for genuine park visitors.
23. The general principles proposed for the car park were:
 - Introduce a four hour time limit for parking 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.
 - Designate parking and non-parking areas including four new disabled bays
 - Enable enforcement against vehicles that break the rules (e.g. overstay the time limit or park in obstructive locations).
24. This project does not propose the introduction of charges for parking in the park.

Informal consultation

25. The full consultation findings, can be found in the "Southwark Park car park consultation report" (Appendix E) but the key issues are summarised in this section.
26. There was no letter drop for this project as it is a public park with visitors from a wide area.
27. Attention to the consultation was drawn via Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Community Council, banners placed within in the car park areas, details on the council website and through engagement with Friends of Southwark Park.

28. The Informal consultation commenced on 29 May 2015 and the deadline to submit responses was detailed as 19 June 2015.
29. Figure 2 details the overall response to the headline questions.

No. of responses	Do you...		
	Support the introduction of a 4 hour time limit to encourage turnover in space for visitors?	Support the proposed positioning and type of parking bays	Support the introduction of enforcement against obstructive parking?
31	55% - Yes 45% - No	55% - Yes 26% - No 19% - No opinion	84% - Yes 10% - No 6% - No opinion

Figure 2

30. Overall, the majority of respondent support the proposed parking layout and the introduction of a 4 hour maximum stay time limit in the car park.
31. During the consultation period a letter was received from Southwark Park Primary school raising concerns about the impact the proposal could have on staff that currently park in the car park, the letter was signed by 17 members of staff. It is also noted that 6 responses to the online questionnaire were received from staff at the school, of which all opposed the 4 hour maximum stay proposal.
32. The key issues raised by Southwark Park Primary School and officers response is detailed in figure 3

Summary of key issues raised by staff at Southwark Park Primary School	Officers response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff currently have no other option but to park in the car park Concerns that the proposal could lead to difficulties recruiting teaching staff in the future Concerns about the high cost and affordability of parking permits Would like the parking permits at a reduced rate of £200 	<p>Southwark Park Primary School falls within the Bermondsey (G) parking zone, which operates Monday to Friday, 8.30am to 6.30pm, the zone was introduced in 1998. The school are entitled to apply for a maximum of 10 business parking permits. These parking permits are for the public highway only and won't be available for use in the park.</p> <p>With regard to issuing parking permits at a reduced rate, the cost of parking permits isn't an element of this consultation. The parking permit fees are set, at a borough-wide level on an annual basis by the Cabinet Member. Representations to alter the fees should be made to the decision maker.</p>

Figure 3

Recommendations

33. In view of the above explanation, it is recommended that the community council comment upon the following recommendation that is due to be made to the cabinet member for environment and the public realm:

- Approve the parking layout and the introduction of a 4 hour maximum time limit on all general parking spaces to encourage turnover in space for genuine park users (Appendix D).
34. Similar regulations have been introduced in Burgess Park and Dulwich Park car parks and the parking regime is working well.

Policy implications

35. 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

36. The implementation of any transport project creates a range of community impacts. All transport schemes aim to improve the safety and security of vulnerable groups and support economic development by improving the overall transport system and access to it.
37. The introduction of yellow lines at junctions gives benefit to all road users through the improvement of inter-visibility and therefore road safety.
38. There is a risk that new restrictions may cause parking to be displaced and, indirectly, have an adverse impact upon road users and neighbouring properties at that location. However this cannot be entirely pre-empted until the recommendations have been implemented and observed
39. With the exception of those benefits and risks identified above, the recommendations are not considered to have a disproportionate affect on any other community group.
40. 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

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

Legal implications

42. Traffic Management Orders would be made under powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984.

43. 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.
44. 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.
45. 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.
46. 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.
47. 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

48. The community council was consulted prior to commencement of the project.
49. Informal public consultation was carried out in May and June 2015, as detailed above.
50. This report provides an opportunity for final comment to be made by the community council prior to a decision scheduled to be taken by the cabinet member for environment and public realm in October 2015.
51. If approved for implementation, any parking modifications will be subject to statutory consultation required in the making of any permanent traffic management orders.

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 A	Canada Water consultation report (circulated separately)
Appendix B	Street by street analysis
Appendix C	Proposed parking layout (zone H CPZ extension)
Appendix D	Southwark Park car park – proposed parking layout
Appendix E	Southwark Park car park – consultation report

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Matthew Hill, Public Realm Programme Manager	
Report Author	Paul Gellard, Project Engineer / Tim Walker, Senior Engineer	
Version	Final	
Dated	05 October 2015	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Director of Law & Democracy	No	No
Strategic Director of Finance and Governance	No	No
Cabinet Member	No	No
Date final report sent to Community Council Team	05 October 2015	