

<b>Item No.</b> 13.1	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 17 October 2015	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Community Council
<b>Report title:</b>		Local parking amendments	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		Grange, Livesey, Surrey Docks, Rotherhithe, Riverside	
<b>From:</b>		Public Realm Programme Manager	

## RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that the following local parking amendments, detailed in the appendices to this report, are approved for implementation subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory consultation and procedures:
  - 1.1 Maltby Street – make temporary double yellow lines permanent to prevent obstructive parking;
  - 1.2 Rotherhithe Street – install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking;
  - 1.3 Elephant Lane – install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking;
  - 1.4 Rouel Road – install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking;
  - 1.5 Lucey Road – install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking;
  - 1.6 Hatcham Road industrial area – install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking;
  - 1.7 Gainsford Street – install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. 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.

3. This report gives recommendations for seven local traffic and parking amendments, involving traffic signs, waiting restrictions and road markings.
4. The origins and reasons for the recommendations are discussed within the key issues section of this report.

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **Maltby Street**

5. The parking design team was contacted by the property services department of the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) requesting the existing single yellow lines adjacent to the police garage on Maltby Street be converted to double yellow lines.
6. Maltby Street is situated within the Grange (GR) controlled parking zone and has a mixture of residential and commercial properties. In recent years there have been a number of large developments built and a thriving market has developed adjacent to Maltby Street on Rope Walk.
7. The MPS describe the police garage as crucial to operational policing and new tactical units moved to this garage at the beginning of August 2015.
8. The police have concerns with access to and from their building as vehicles are parked overnight and at weekends on the single yellow lines which operate Monday to Friday 8.30am – 6.30pm.
9. An officer meet with a chief inspector from the police service, 9 July 2015 to discuss the situation, it was noted that there are two access points into the garage and if vehicles are parked on the single yellow line the police vehicles are unable to enter or exit the garage.
10. The council installed temporary double yellow lines on 31 July 2015 so that the two access points to the police garage remain operational at any time.
11. It is therefore recommended, as shown in Appendix 1, that the temporary double yellow lines installed on 31 July 2015 are made permanent to maintain access to the police garage at any time.

### **Rotherhithe Street**

12. The parking design team was contacted by a resident with concerns of obstructive parking on Rotherhithe Street between the old public house “The Clipper” and Surrey Dock Farm.
13. Rotherhithe Street (B205) runs the entire length of the peninsula and is predominately residential with large apartment buildings.
14. The carriageway varies in widths and there are existing double yellow lines at points where the carriageway cannot support parking.
15. An officer visited Rotherhithe Street, 17 June 2015, and identified two locations where waiting restrictions are required:

- outside and opposite Nos.301/303
  - outside Stanton House opposite bus stop
16. Outside Nos.301/303 parked vehicles both reduce the visibility of oncoming vehicles and narrow the width of the carriageway to an unacceptable width. The total width of the carriageway is only 5.7 metres.
  17. Outside Stanton House the carriageway is 6.5 metres wide, however there is a bus stop on the east side that services the C10 bus route. At the time of the visit there was a vehicle parked opposite the bus stop. When the C10 bus stopped the carriageway was blocked for through traffic.
  18. It is therefore recommended that, as shown in Appendix 2, double yellow lines are installed outside Stanton House and outside and opposite Nos.301/303 Rotherhithe Street to prevent obstructive parking at any time.

### **Elephant Lane**

19. The parking design team was contacted by residents who raised concerns about dangerous and obstructive parking on Elephant Lane.
20. Elephant Lane is predominately residential and consists of two arms with only one entry point off St Maryschurch Street.
21. The residents provided photograph evidence of the obstructive parking which takes place opposite the off-street parking places in front of their properties and adjacent to the residential car parks.
22. An officer carried out a site visit, 24 June 2015, and noted that a vehicle was parking obstructing the highway adjacent to the car park of Nos.33 -43.
23. Officers wrote to affected residents on 23 July 2015 asking for comments on proposed double yellow lines and all respondents were supportive. However one response requested that no new restrictions be installed in front of dropped kerbs as they can be enforced without restrictions if they wished.
24. It is therefore recommended that, as shown in Appendix 3, double yellow lines are installed to prevent obstructive parking at any time, at locations adjacent to the off street parking spaces.

### **Rouel Road**

25. The parking design team was contacted by a resident with concerns about a parked vehicle obstructing the entrance to the car park for Spa Court on Rouel Road.
26. Rouel Road is predominately residential with large apartment blocks and an industrial estate near the junction with Spa Road.
27. At present there are a double yellow lines and a single yellow line which operates Monday to Friday 10am - 2pm.
28. An officer carried out a site visit in June 2015 to observe the parking on Rouel Road.

29. The car park entrance to Spa Court has single yellow line across it and this may lead motorists to think it is acceptable to park when the single yellow lines are not in operation.
30. The resident stated that since new flats were built the volume of traffic has increased and when the single yellow line is not operating vehicles park too close to the dropped kerb entrance to the car park. This makes turning into and out of the car park difficult.
31. It is recommended that, as shown in Appendix 4, the existing single yellow line in front of the entrance to the car park of Spa Court is converted to double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking at any time.

### **Lucey Road**

32. Parking design team was contacted by a resident with concerns of dangerous and obstructive parking at the junction of Rouel Road and Lucey Road.
33. At present the junction has double yellow lines but they are short of the North West kerb line of Lucey Road at the junction with Rouel Road.
34. Ensuring adequate visibility between road users is important for safety. Visibility should generally be sufficient to allow road users to see potential conflicts or dangers in the advance of the distance in which they will be able to brake and come to a stop.
35. Vehicles that are parked at a junction have the effect of substantially reducing visibility between road users and reducing stopping sight distances (SSD). This is the viewable distance required for a driver to see so that they can make a complete stop before colliding with something in the street, e.g. pedestrian, cyclist or a stopped vehicle.
36. It is noted that almost two thirds of cyclist killed or seriously injured in 2013 were involved in collisions at, or near, a road junction, with "T" junctions being the most commonly involved.
37. Children and those in wheelchairs (whose eyelevel is below the height of a parked car) are disproportionately affected by vehicles parked too close to a junction. The Guide Dogs for the Blind Association (Guide Dogs) strongly recommend that yellow lines are implemented at junctions as these are potentially more dangerous.
38. The Highway Code makes it clear that motorists must not park within 10 metres of a junction, unless in a designated parking bay. However the council has no power to enforce this without the introduction of a traffic order and subsequent implementation of waiting restrictions (yellow lines).
39. The proposal to install yellow lines at this junction is in accordance with the council's adopted Southwark Streetscape Design Manual (SSDM) design standard on Highway Visibility (DS114 – Highway Visibility) see Appendix 5.

40. It is recommended that, as shown in Appendix 6, that the existing double yellow lines on the North West kerb line are extended by 6.8 metres to provide clear sight lines to oncoming vehicles entering the junction at any time.

### **Hatcham Road industrial area**

41. The parking design team was contacted by a business on Hatcham Road regarding access for large delivery vehicles to their site
42. The area in which Hatcham Road is located contains five streets that make up an industrial estate. There are only two entry points off Ilderton Road into this area which contain factories, warehouses and churches.
43. An officer meet with representatives of the business, 23 July 2015, on Hatcham Road to discuss the issue of obstructive parking that can prevent large Lorries delivering materials to their factory and products being dispatched.
44. The London Fire Brigade (LFB) carried out two visits to this area, the first on Saturday 15 August 2015 and the second Thursday 20 August 2015. They raised concerns regarding access due to obstructive parking in different locations either during the week or on the weekend.
45. Hatcham Road and Record Street were a concern for the LFB for access during the week and Manor Grove, Hatcham Road and Ormside Road on the weekend.
46. The factory has a yard which allows rigid vehicles to load/unload off-street but when large articulated lorries deliver or collect they load/unload on-street adjacent to the gates of the yard.
47. The majority of deliveries take place Monday to Friday and the number of deliveries increases before the Christmas period.
48. In addition, the road network manager raised concerns with access and obstruction to the public highway on Record Street between Hatcham Road and Ilderton Road, slip road.
49. There is a waste recycling depot at the junction of Record Street and Ilderton Road slip road and in August 2015 there was a fire at this location and there were concerns regarding the amount of skips and vehicles on the highway.
50. Officers have over the years visited this industrial estate and introduced at any time waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) in an ad hoc way. With feedback from the LFB and officer observations it is felt these recommendations will provide access for large vehicles to businesses in the estate and address the concerns about emergency service vehicle access.
51. It is therefore recommended that, as shown in Appendix 7, that double yellow lines are installed to improve access for large vehicles and to prevent obstruction:
  - On the west side of Hatcham Road (between Penarth St and Manor Grove)
  - The south side of Record Street (Between Hatcham Road and Ilderton

- Road)
- The north side of Record St (between Ormside St and Hatcham Road)
- The north side of Penarth St (between Hatcham Road and Ilderton Road)
- Short lengths along Manor Grove.

### **Gainsford Street**

52. The parking design team was contacted by Councillor Al-Samerai on behalf of the Vanilla and Sesame residents association who have concerns regarding obstructive parking at the entrance to the blocks car park on Gainsford Street.
53. The issue of obstructive parking has been raised in the Shad Thames area before and a proposal was originally presented to the Bermondsey and Rotherhithe community council in 19 March 2014. See Appendix 8
54. When this traffic management order was advertised it received eight objections and these were sent to the meeting held on 21 July for consideration.
55. The community council decision was that the statutory objections made in relation to the proposed waiting restriction be noted and that the following proposals be implemented,
  - Tower Bridge Square – install double yellow lines outside both gates that lead to square
56. The remainder of the objection was upheld by community council and the rest of the proposal was dropped.
57. Officers have now been asked to visit the Gainsford Street again by the Vanilla and Sesame residents association who have requested that the entrance to their property on Gainsford Street, which was one of those locations not progressed, be protected by double yellow lines to prevent vehicles obstructing access.
58. Gainsford Street has dropped kerbs that are protected by double yellow lines and some that are protected by single yellow lines this may give visitors the impression that the dropped kerbs with single yellow lines only in use during the day and it is acceptable to park in front of them evenings and at weekends.
59. Therefore it is recommended that, as shown in Appendix 8, that single yellow line adjacent to dropped kerbs on Gainsford Street are converted to double yellow lines to provide access at any time.

### **Policy implications**

60. The recommendations contained within this report are consistent with the policies of the Transport Plan 2011,
  - 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**

61. The policies within the transport plan are upheld within this report have been subject to an equality impact assessment
62. 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.
63. All The introduction of yellow lines at junctions gives benefit to all road users through the improvement of inter-visibility and therefore road safety.
64. 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 preempted until the recommendation have been implemented and observed.
65. 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.
66. 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 refuse vehicles.
  - Improving road safety, in particular for vulnerable road users, on the public highway.

## **Resource implications**

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

## **Legal implications**

68. Traffic management orders would be made under powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984.
69. 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.
70. 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.
71. Should any objections be received they must be properly considered in light of administrative law principles, human rights law and relevant statutory powers.
72. 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 provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway.

73. 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**

74. Where public or stakeholder consultation has already been completed, this is described within the key issues section of the report.
75. 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.
76. Should the recommendations be approved the council must follow the procedures contained with Part II and III of the regulations which are supplemented by the council's own processes. This process is summarised as:
- a) publication of a proposal notice in a local newspaper (Southwark News)
  - b) publication of a proposal notice in the London Gazette
  - c) display of notices in roads affected by the orders
  - d) consultation with statutory authorities
  - e) making available for public inspection any associated documents (eg. plans, draft orders, statement of reasons) via the council's website<sup>1</sup> or by appointment at 160 Tooley Street, SE1
  - f) a 21 day consultation period during which time any person may comment upon or object to the proposed order
77. 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 to the address specified on the notice.
78. 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 proposal, accede to or reject the objection. The council will subsequently notify all objectors of the final decision.

### **Programme Timeline**

79. If these items are approved by the community council they will be progressed in line with the below, approximate timeline:
-



- Traffic orders (statutory consultation) – October to November 2015
- Implementation – December 2015 to January 2016

## 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: <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>	Leah Coburn 020 7525 4744

## APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Maltby Street – install double yellow lines
Appendix 2	Rotherhithe Street – install double yellow lines
Appendix 3	Elephant Lane – install double yellow lines
Appendix 4	Rouel Road – install double yellow lines
Appendix 5	DS114 – Highway visibility
Appendix 6	Lucey Road – install double yellow lines
Appendix 7	Hatcham Road area – install double yellow lines
Appendix 8	Gainsford Street – install double yellow lines

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Matthew Hill, Public Realm Programme Manager	
<b>Report Author</b>	Tim Walker, Senior Engineer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	6 October 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 Law & Democracy	No	No
Strategic Director of Finance and Governance	No	No
<b>Cabinet Member</b>	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</b>	6 October 2015	