

Item No. 14.	Classification: Open	Date: 18 November 2015	Meeting Name: Camberwell Community Council
Report title:		Local traffic and parking amendments objection report	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		South Camberwell	
From:		Head of Highways	

RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that the objections received against a non-strategic traffic management matter are considered and determined as follows:
 - St Francis Road – that the objections made against the proposal to install double yellow lines in the turning head be considered and rejected, and officers be instructed to proceed and make the traffic order, notify the objectors and implement the works

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:
 - Determination of objections to traffic management orders that do not relate to strategic or borough-wide issues
3. This report gives recommendations concerning objections received to a proposed non-strategic traffic management order.
4. The origins and reasons for the recommendations are discussed within the key issues section of this report.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

St Francis Road

5. On 15 July 2015 Camberwell Community Council approved double yellow lines on the turning heads and adjacent to existing vehicle crossovers at the end of St Francis Road to improve access to adjacent properties and facilitate vehicle turning movements. The proposed extent of the double yellow lines is shown in Appendix 2.
6. The council carried out a statutory consultation from 13 August 2015 to 3 September 2015 during which three objections were received.

Background

7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. 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 (e.g. 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.
13. 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 probably as a result of the vehicles parking on the carriageway.

Objection detail

14. The three objections received (see Appendix 1) to the proposal on St Francis Road are summarised as:
 - There is already a lack of parking spaces
 - It would make it difficult to park during the week
 - The whole street should be restricted to permits only
15. Officers wrote to each of the objectors responding to the points they raised in their objections. They were also advised that their objections would be sent to the Camberwell Community Council for determination.
16. We are not able to address the objectors request that the street becomes a permit zone through this process as this would require a controlled parking zone consultation and that programme is set by the cabinet member and senior officers.
17. St Francis Road was last consulted regarding a controlled parking zone as part of the Grove Vale consultation in 2011/12. The results of that consultation

showed that St Francis Road did not support the introduction of a CPZ. Subsequently a decision was taken by the cabinet member for transport, environment and recycling not to introduce a parking zone.

Recommendation

18. It is recommended that the objections made against the proposal to install double yellow lines to prevent parking in the turning heads, as detailed in Appendix 1, be considered and rejected, since the original intention of the scheme is to facilitate safety and vehicular access and there is no other way of achieving this within the public highway. It is also recommended that officers be instructed to write to the objectors to explain the decision, and proceed and make the traffic order and implement the works.

Policy implications

19. 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

20. The policies within the transport plan are upheld within this report have been subject to an equality impact assessment
21. The recommendations are area based and therefore will have greatest affect upon those people living working or travelling in the vicinity of the areas where the proposals are made.
22. All The introduction of yellow lines at junctions gives benefit to all road users through the improvement of inter-visibility and therefore road safety.
23. 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 recommendation have been implemented and observed.
24. With the exception of those benefits and risks identified above, the recommendation is not considered to have a disproportionate effect on any other community or group.
25. 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

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

Legal implications

27. Paragraph 16 of Part 3H of the Southwark constitution sets out that the community council will take decisions on the determination of objections to traffic management orders that do not relate to strategic or borough wide issues.
28. Traffic management orders would be made under powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984.
29. 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.
30. 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.
31. Should any objections be received they must be properly considered in light of administrative law principles, human rights law and relevant statutory powers.
32. Objections have been received following the statutory consultation process in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 and the RTRA 1984. Under Regulation 14 the Council has discretion to modify the Order following any objections received, and the recommendation to proceed with proposed double yellow lines following the making of objections would be in accordance with Regulation 14.
33. 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.
34. 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

35. Statutory consultation has already been completed, as described within the key issues section of the report.

36. 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. This report deals with objections received as part of that process.

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	Leah Coburn Tel. 0207 525 4744

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	St Francis Road – Objections
Appendix 2	St Francis Road – proposed new double yellow lines

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Matthew Hill, Head of Highways	
Report Author	Leah Coburn, Group Manager – Network Development	
Version	Final	
Dated	5 November 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 Constitutional Team	5 November 2015	