

<b>Item No.</b> N/A	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> October 2016	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Cabinet Member for Environment and Public Realm
<b>Report title:</b>		Quietway 7: Elephant and Castle to Crystal Palace	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		Chaucer, East Walworth, Faraday, Camberwell Green , Brunswick Park, South Camberwell, Village, College	
<b>From:</b>		Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure	

## RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Cabinet Member for Environment and Public Realm:

1. Approves the implementation of the Elephant & Castle to Crystal Palace Quietway proposals, as set out in the table 1 (below) and Appendix A, in accordance with recommendations highlighted below, and subject to statutory procedures and a detailed design and safety review.

Section	Ward/Community Council	Recommendation
1	Chaucer, East Walworth, Faraday. (Borough , Bankside & Walworth CC)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop and implement proposals at the following locations as consulted on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Falmouth Road</li> <li>• Rodney Place</li> <li>• Rodney Road</li> <li>• Brandon Street</li> <li>• Portland Street</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Implement minor revisions at the following locations in response to consultation feedback: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>Harper Road</u> – introduce waiting restrictions to improve visibility for all road users</li> <li>b. <u>Rodney Place</u> - a safer layout to accommodate deliveries for National Windscreens.</li> <li>c. <u>Portland Street/Albany Road junction</u> – new cycle bypass which will reduce delays to cyclists using the Quietway</li> <li>d. <u>Albany Road</u> - Mandatory cycle lanes amended to advisory lanes</li> <li>e. <u>Albany Road</u> – footway buildout south eastern side omitted for future aspiration for two-way track</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

		f. <u>Portland Street</u> – direct pedestrian crossing amended with staggered crossing
2	Camberwell Green , Brunswick Park, South Camberwell (Camberwell CC)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>New Church Road to Edmund Street to Peckham Road</u>: develop and implement proposals as consulted. A temporary alignment is proposed via New Church Road during construction activities in Burgess Park</li> <li>2. <u>Wilson Road to Lettsom Road</u> – develop and implement proposals as consulted</li> <li>3. <u>Dog Kennel Hill/Champion Hill</u> – proposals dropped. Traffic modelling indicates that opening the right turn from Grove Hill Road to Grove Lane will adversely impact on the Dog Kennel Hill, which is considered a strategic road</li> <li>4. <u>Champion Hill</u> – Proposals dropped due to inability to proceed with Dog Kennel Hill/Champion Hill junction changes. Officers to explore funding opportunities to reinvestigate concerns about traffic volume on Champion Hill.</li> </ol>
3	Village ,College (Dulwich CC )	<p><u>Calton Avenue</u>: Implement as per amendments tabled at the community council , subject to detailed design and safety review –appendix A</p> <p><u>Dulwich Village junction</u>: Implement proposals as per amendments tabled at the community council, subject to detailed design and safety review. Where possible trial the change in priority at Court Lane/Calton Avenue junction post implementation. Appendix A.</p> <p><u>Turney Road</u>: Implement as per amendments tabled at the community council , subject to detailed design and safety review. Appendix A.</p> <p><u>Dulwich Wood Avenue</u>: Implement as per amendments tabled at the community council , subject to detailed design and safety review. Appendix A.</p> <p><u>Farquhar Road</u>: Implement as per amendments tabled at the community council, subject to detailed design and safety review. Appendix A.</p>

2. Notes that TfL have agreed to meet with officers, residents and local councillors in Dulwich to discuss working with Southwark on a holistic review of traffic in the Dulwich area and that any funding needed to undertake such a review will be made available by the council through the LIP funding.

3. Note that some of the proposals require a traffic management order prior to implementation and that if any objections to the related statutory consultation cannot be informally resolved, then consideration of those objection and a decision on whether to proceed with that part of the scheme will be subject to a further report to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Public Realm.
4. Note that the section through Burgess Park, between Portland Street/Albany Road and New Church Road/Edmund Street, is subject to a separate approval process as this part of the route is not on public highway.

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

5. The council's constitution gives the Cabinet Member for Environment and Public Realm responsibility for (amongst other things) strategic traffic and highways schemes
6. Quietways are a network of improved streets across London designed to make it easier for less confident people to cycle by calming traffic and ensuring streets are safer and improved for all road users. The measures include safer junctions, improved crossings for pedestrians, more efficient signal junctions, and a more pleasant street environment.
7. In Southwark there are six Quietways. Southwark's Quietway route network was adopted by the council's Cabinet as part of its Cycling Strategy in June 2015. The entire budget allocated to Southwark by Transport for London to deliver the Quietways network is £12m. Quietway 7 is part of phase 1 of the Quietway network and runs from Elephant & Castle to Crystal Palace. In Southwark the route will run from Falmouth Road via Portland Street, Burgess Park, Camberwell Grove, Calton Avenue, across Dulwich Village junction, across Croxted Road into Lambeth and back to Southwark via Dulwich Wood Avenue, ending at Farquhar Road / Crystal Palace Parade junction. Details of the recommended proposals are shown at appendix A.
8. The first phase of Quietway routes across London were chosen for the following reasons:
  - Met the Quietways criteria
  - Buildable by March 2017
  - Included a good geographical spread linking key destinations across 17 London boroughs
  - Demonstrated different Quietways characteristics, e.g. routes through parks, existing cycle routes, different levels of interventions needed, or complementing existing and planned infrastructure.
9. At the time of preparing this report officers were awaiting confirmation that Lambeth Council Cabinet member has formally approved implementation of Quietway proposals in their borough. No proposals will be implemented in Southwark until this has been formally confirmed by Lambeth.
10. Quietway 7 traverses three community councils: Borough, Bankside and Walworth, Camberwell, and Dulwich.
11. With an emphasis on improving safety for all road users , the key benefits of Quietway 7 are outlined below:

## **Pedestrians and school children**

- Safer walking environment by measures that enforce the borough wide 20mph speed limit, i.e. improved traffic calming
- Providing safer pedestrian crossings
- Safer crossings at junctions e.g. double yellow lines to improve visibility at blind spots
- Measures to reinforce priority for pedestrians at informal crossings eg improved signage and visibility, and change in paving material at crossing locations
- Pedestrian count down feature at Dulwich Village junction
- Wider footways around school entrances
- Reduced crossing distance at junctions
- Improve footway surfacing where needed
- Take advantage to declutter and rationalise street furniture making the environment more pleasant.

## **Cyclists**

- Provide segregation for cyclists at busy junctions
- Cyclists having their own signal phase, not mixing with traffic at busy junctions, such as the Portland Street/Albany Road, and Dulwich Village junction
- Segregated mandatory cycle contra flow where cycling uphill
- Segregation with-flow cycle lane – Farquhar Road
- Cycle friendly traffic calming measures
- Resurface carriageway where needed
- Safer junctions with double yellow lines
- Removing pinch points.

## **Drivers**

- Remove pinch points which impede traffic flow
- Reduce delays at signal junctions e.g. Dulwich Village, Portland Street / Albany Road
- Encourage safer driving behaviours with the introduction of additional traffic calming measures where necessary
- Improve safety at junctions and safer parking practice.

## **Improving the streetscene**

- Introduce street greening where possible
- Declutter and rationalise street furniture
- Resurface carriageway/footway where required.

12. Further detailed information on the consultation measures process, and results for the various section of the route are detailed in table 2.0 below:

Section	Report Reference	Report Title
1 (Falmouth Road to Albany Road)	Appendix B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Responses to consultations questions</li><li>• Consultation issues and responses</li><li>• Consultation areas</li><li>• Detailed responses</li></ul>

2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(Edmund Street / New Church Road to Dog Kennel Hill )</li> <li>Champion Hill</li> </ul>	Appendix C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New Church/Edmund Street junction to Peckham Road</li> <li>Wilson Road to Lettsom Street</li> <li>Dog Kennel Hill/Champion Hill</li> </ul>
	Appendix E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Champion Hill engagement</li> </ul>
3 (Calton Avenue to Crystal Palace)	Appendix C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Calton Avenue</li> <li>Dulwich Village</li> <li>Turney Road</li> <li>Dulwich Wood Avenue and Farquhar Road</li> <li>Community engagement activities</li> <li>Changes now proposed detailed</li> </ul>
Quietway 7 recommended proposal	Appendix A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposals</li> </ul>

## KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

13. Formal consultation period, response and support for the three sections is detailed in table 3.0 below:

Section	Consultation period	Response rate	General support % in favour
1 -Falmouth Road to Albany Road	September – October 2015	4.5% ( 77 responses out of 1700)	84%
2 - New Church /Edmund Street junction to Champion Hill	October – November 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Edmund Street to Peckham Road - 4.4% (31 responses out of 700)</li> </ul>	74%
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wilson Road to Lettsom Street - 4.8% (29 responses out of 600)</li> </ul>	72%
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dog kennel Hill/Champion Hill junction - 3.7% (81 responses out of 2200)</li> </ul>	75%
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Champion Hill - 40% (471 responses out of 1180)</li> </ul>	

3. Dulwich	February – March 2016	• Calton Avenue 30.4% (292 responses out of 960)	28%
		• Dulwich Village Avenue 32.8% (473 responses out of 1440)	29%
		• Turney Road 44.2% (212 responses out of 480)	38%
		• Dulwich Wood Avenue 36.3% (87 responses out of 240)	36.3%

### Community council consultation

14. In accordance with Part 3H paragraph 19 and 21 of the council's constitution, community councils are to be consulted on the detail of strategic parking/traffic/safety schemes.
15. On the 21 November 2015, officers consulted Borough, Bankside and Walworth community council reporting feedback from the public consultation exercise and a draft of the proposed recommendations to the cabinet member for Environment and Public Realm, as per this report. The community council resolved on the following comments:

- There are concerns about the low response rate. A re-consultation should be considered
- Further concerns have been raised about cyclists going through Burgess Park, and about the speed of cyclists using the Quietway
- There would be an effect on residents' parking and their needs needed to be taken into account.

#### Officer response:

- Proceed without the need to re-consult, as suggested by the Community Council due low consultation response rate. The timescale for delivery of the Quietway programme will not allow for re-consultation. The Highway team is seeking to improve its consultation process in the future to ensure local residents are more engaged and can make representations during consultation. The Community Council will be updated on this response once this report is approved.
- Concerns raised at the November Community Council about the speed of cyclists using Burgess Park to be addressed as part of comprehensive design for the park.
- No further changes to loss of parking. Concerns raised at the November Community Council about the loss of residents' parking have been carefully considered. Minimum parking spaces will be removed for road safety reasons and no further loss is proposed. Summary of parking spaces to be lost is outline below.

<b>SUMMARY OF LOSS OF PARKING SPACES</b>		
<b>Location</b>	<b>Reasons for removing parking</b>	<b>Number of parking spaces removed</b>
Brandon Street	Yellow lines extension at junctions to improve safety	3
	To improve access for pedestrian's (remove footway parking )	4
Portland Street	Improve access for pedestrians (remove footway parking )	9
	Yellow lines extension to improve access and safety at pedestrians crossing opposite Trafalgar Street	3
Albany Road / Portland Street junction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Portland Street (opposite Chiltern House)</li> <li>• Albany Road (both sides between scheme extent )</li> </ul>	To accommodate cycle/pedestrian improvements at junction	28
		30

16. Reporting feedback from the public consultation exercise and a draft recommendations to the cabinet member for the Environment and Public Realm, the community council resolved the following comments :
- That community council gave its support to the recommendations contained in the report
17. On 22 June 2016, officers consulted Dulwich community council reporting feedback from the public consultation exercise and a draft recommendation to the cabinet member for the Environment and Public Realm. The community council resolved the following comments:
- That the cabinet member and officers should take forward a second subsequent proposal to look at a more holistic view of traffic in the area, focussing in particular on safer schools
  - That the cabinet member and officers ensure that key elements of the scheme are trialled before full implementation where possible, for instance narrowing three lanes of traffic to two; while also ensuring that the trialling should not significantly impact on the budget for the completed works
  - That the cabinet member pause the decision until the conclusions to the 'coaches to schools study' are known to allow the impact of that to be included and considered
  - Pedestrian guard rail should be retained at the Dulwich Village junction, the exact extent of which should be agreed with the neighbouring school

- That the cabinet member and officers consider how the recent introduction of the North Dulwich controlled parking zone will affect the proposals.
- That the cabinet member and officers ensure that Lambeth Council's decision-making will not adversely affect these proposals and that Lambeth and Southwark co-ordinate the implementation of the route.
- That the cabinet member and officers consider, with Lambeth, alternative or additional routes or links particularly for the section of route on Gipsy Hill and Dulwich Wood Avenue.

Officer response:

- Proposal for a more holistic review of traffic issues in the wider area, focussing on safer schools to be investigated further in conjunction with the Dulwich Safer route to school team and schools in the area. Officers will explore funding opportunities. TfL have confirmed that their officers will attend a site visit/meeting with local stakeholders with a view to working with Southwark on such a holistic review. Funding would need to be identified through the borough's LIP allocation.
- Where possible proposals will be trialled post implementation, especially the change in priority at Court Lane, with a view to amending the layout if impact on traffic delays is deemed unacceptable compared conditions prior to the change.
- The study has now been completed. None of the recommendations in the coaches study adversely affects or precludes the Quietway proposals. None of the physical on street interventions recommended in the report is on the Quietway alignment. The main recommendations in that study will complement the Quietway proposal, in particular significantly reducing the impact of school coaches on Calton Avenue.
- Extent of guardrail to be retained will be discuss with neighbouring school prior to making any changes.
- Impact of North Dulwich controlled parking zone on roads outside the zone is under review. Currently there is no substantial evidence that there's been significant parking displacement to roads along the Quietway due to the new CPZ. The council will continue to review the impact of the CPZ on adjacent roads and consult with local residents where there is significant pressure on parking outside the zone. The parking restrictions proposed at junctions as part of Quietway 7 will improve safety conditions for all road users, regardless of where parking displacement may be occurring.
- Southwark Officers are liaising with Lambeth to ensure co-ordination at the design and implementation stages.
- Officers will investigate, in discussion with Lambeth, the feasibility of an alternative cycling route from Gipsy Road to safely connect into Dulwich Wood Avenue, subject to funding being available. However this would need to be part of a future phase of works as it could not be delivered in the timescales required to deliver this Quietway.

18. Detailed consultation results are provided in appendices B, C, D and E.



## Response to significant issues raised and modifications to proposals

19. Rodney Palace loading bay: Design modified post consultation to allow safer access for delivery Lorries to National Windscreens. A floating loading bay now introduced with cycle lane on the offside-see Appendix B.
20. Loss of Parking for East Street traders and shoppers: The removal of footway parking is aimed at improving safety conditions for pedestrians and cyclists by removing obstructions to visibility. Existing 1.2m footway is inadequate for wheel-chair or pushchair users. The council has a clear policy to remove all footway parking in such circumstances in line with the road user hierarchy. Loading and unloading is permitted on single / double yellow lines for a short period. Proposals would not restrict loading in this location so would not have an adverse impact on deliveries to market traders
21. Design changes at Portland Street/Albany Road junction: The design is now improved to maximise the efficiency of the junction, reduce signal cycle time and allow more green time for cyclists using the Quietway alignment. A new track is provided for westbound cyclists using Wells Way and a staggered crossing now introduced on Portland Street.
22. Edmund Street point closure: This was suggested by Southwark cyclists during public consultation due to highway works relating to the new housing development. The new highway alignment and parking layout narrows the effective road width which may affect access and safety for cyclists. An initial investigation reveals that any closure will have wider traffic reassignment impacts on the road network. It is therefore felt due to programme and resource implications this is out of scope of Quietway 7
23. Champion Hill/Dog Kennel Hill junction: This proposal is now dropped due to concerns raised by Transport for London that opening the right turn from Grove Hill Road to Grove Lane will increase the cycle time at the junction which will adversely affect delays on the strategic route network.
24. Champion Hill traffic management changes: This is now dropped due to the inability to proceed with Champion Hill/Dog Kennel Hill junction proposals. It is recommended that funding is sought to further explore measures to reduce through traffic on Champion Hill, Grove Hill and Camberwell Grove. See Appendix E.
25. Camberwell Grove - traffic management changes: This was suggested by some residents during consultation. This would need to be carefully investigated further due to impact of traffic displacements on the wider road network. This could not be delivered in the timescales required to deliver this Quietway. It is recommended that funding is sought to further explore measures to reduce through traffic on Champion Hill, Grove Hill and Camberwell Grove.
26. Impact of coach study on proposals in Dulwich: The study aims to minimise the use of Calton Avenue by Coaches, which will complement the quietway proposals. None of the draft recommendations in the study adversely affects or precludes the Quietway proposals. None of the physical on street interventions recommended in the report is on the Quietway alignment
27. Calton Avenue: Proposals amended following feedback from consultation, mainly relocation of proposed zebra crossing, reduction in the loss of parking. Refer to Appendix A.
28. Dulwich Village junction: Where possible measures may be trialled, especially a change in priority at Calton Avenue and Court Lane post implementation. It should be noted that most signal features can not be trialled on site. It is proposed to drop the proposed left turn

ban from Dulwich Village to Turney Road subject to a safety review and approval from Department for Transport and Transport for London.

29. Turney Road – Proposed amendments to the proposals are outlined in Appendix A.
30. Dulwich Wood Avenue - Proposed amendments to the proposals are outlined in Appendix A.
31. Farquhar Road - Proposed amendments to the proposals are outline in Appendix A.

#### **Measures considered out of scope from consultation**

32. Burgess Park – Provisions for cyclists within Burgess Park will be considered as part of the wider regeneration programme for the park.
33. Camberwell Grove traffic management changes – Due to the impact of any traffic management changes on Camberwell Grove on the wider road network, it will not be possible to accommodate this within the current programme and resource. It is recommended that funding is sought to further explore measures to reduce through traffic on Champion Hill, Grove Hill and Camberwell Grove.
34. Further negotiation with TfL to address Champion Hill/Dog Kennel Hill junction and the impact on Champion Hill and Camberwell Grove.

#### **Basis for recommendations**

35. On the basis of the overall consultation results, and the modifications made to the proposals to address issues raised in the consultation process, as detailed in Appendix A, officers recommend that the amended Quietway 7 proposals proceed to implementation subject to statutory procedures.
36. If any objections to the statutory consultation cannot be informally resolved, then consideration of those objections and a decision on whether to proceed with the related parts of the scheme will be the subject of a further report to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Public Realm.
37. A summary of the final changes now proposed for detailed design and implementation are outlined in Appendix A.

#### **Policy**

38. The recommendations contained within this report are consistent with the policies of the Transport Plan 2011 (TP/11) and principles of the emerging Cycle Strategy (SCS), in particular:

##### **TP/11**

Policy 1.1 - pursue overall traffic reduction

Policy 2.3 - promote and encourage sustainable travel choices in the borough

Policy 4.2 - create places that people can enjoy

Policy 5.1 - improve safety on our roads and to help make all modes of transport safer.

##### **SCS**

Principle 1 (Stress free cycling) – Objectives 1.1, 1.2, 1.3

- Principle 2 (Cycling as a priority) – Objectives 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.7
- Principle 3 (Cycling for everyone) - Objectives 3.6 and 3.7
- Principle 4 (Cycling for health and wellbeing) – Objective 4.3
- Principle 5 (Cycling as an investment) – Objective 5.2

### **Resource implications**

- 39. The project is funded by Transport for London as part of quietway delivery programme. There are currently 8 Quietways proposed in Southwark and the committed allocation from TfL is £12million.
- 40. Quietway 7 allocation within Southwark is £2.5 million out of which £2.2m is available. The cost of the proposed scheme is £1.8 million and this together with cost of fees, development cost and contingency, will be contained within the allocated budget.
- 41. Staffing and any other costs connected with this recommendation to be contained with existing business unit budgets.
- 42. As the roads along the cycle route are on existing assets, any future maintenance cost of the completed scheme will be funded from the highways revenue budget.

### **Consultations**

- 43. The public and informal consultation undertaken is detailed above and in the relevant Appendices B, C, D and E.
- 44. Part of the scheme requires traffic management orders. The process for implementing a traffic management order involves a statutory consultation procedure. If any objections are received that cannot be informally resolved, determination of them will be the subject of a further report.

### **COMMUNITY IMPACT STATEMENT**

- 45. 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.
- 46. This scheme was identified as one which would help to deliver the council's aim of increasing walking and cycling levels in the borough by improving safe access to local amenities/shops without any noticeable adverse impact on the vulnerable road users.
- 47. This scheme is intended to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport. The proposals are designed to encourage inclusive mobility e.g. drop kerbs, tactile paving, cross-fall gradient, unobstructed footways, colour contrast material, pedestrian crossings etc.
- 48. The Council believes the scheme (having regard to the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises, the effect on the amenities of the locality affected and the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles) contributes towards 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.
- 49. This project is particularly geared to improving conditions for pedestrians and cyclists by reducing traffic speeds, improving safety and accessibility for vulnerable road users and improving the streetscape. The proposals are just not for current cyclists, but are for

people who have always been put off cycling by the thought of sharing the road with high volumes of cars, vans, buses and Lorries. The scheme objective is to significantly increase the number of residents using cycling as their preferred mode of transport, particularly for local journeys, which has both health and environmental benefits

50. The measures proposed as part of the Quietway scheme promote inclusive cycling, so that people of all abilities can safely cycle the route to reach their destination of choice. A key element of the scheme is to remove existing barriers to cycling such as chicanes and gates that are currently preventative to mobility cycles.

## **SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS**

### **Director of Law and Democracy**

51. The cabinet member for Environment and Public Realm is being asked to approve the implementation of the Elephant and Castle to Crystal Palace Quietway as set out within this report.
52. Parts of the scheme require traffic management orders or amendments to existing traffic management orders. The process for implementing and amending traffic management orders involves a statutory consultation procedure. If any objections to the consultation cannot be informally resolved, then consideration of those objections and a decision as to whether or not to proceed with that part of the scheme will be subject to a further IDM report to the cabinet member for Environment and Public Realm.
53. The Equality Act 2010 introduced the public sector equality duty, which merged existing race, sex and disability equality duties and extended them to include other protected characteristics; namely age, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, religion and belief and sex and sexual orientation, including marriage and civil partnership. In summary those subject to the equality duty, which includes the council, must in the exercise of their functions: (i) have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation; and (ii) foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
54. The Human Rights Act 1998 imposed a duty on the council as a public authority to apply the European Convention on Human Rights; as a result the Council must not act in a way which is incompatible with these rights. The most important rights for planning purposes are Article 8 (respect for homes); Article 6 (natural justice) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (peaceful enjoyment of property).
55. The Elephant and Castle to Crystal Palace proposals are not anticipated to have an adverse effect on the equalities and human rights of any individual or group.
56. The council's constitution gives the Cabinet Member for Environment and the Public Realm responsibility for (amongst other things) traffic management and road safety. Part 3D of the constitution provides the responsibility of agreeing statutory and other strategies in relation to their area falls to the individual cabinet member. Approving the implementation of Elephant and Castle to Crystal Palace Quietway would therefore fall within this paragraph.

### **Strategic Director of Finance and Governance**

57. The report is requesting approval from the Cabinet Member for Environment and the Public Realm to implement the Elephant and Castle to Crystal Palace Quietway following the public consultation exercise as detailed in this report.

58. It is noted that the cost of the proposed scheme together estimated with the cost of fees and contingency will be contained within the Quietway 7 budget allocated within the council's capital programme funded by Transport for London Officers should ensure the scheme is completed within the time limit set by TfL for grant funding
59. It is noted that any future maintenance costs arising from this investment will be funded from existing departmental revenue budgets.
60. Staffing and any other costs connected with this recommendation to be contained with existing departmental revenue budgets.

## BACKGROUND PAPERS

Background Paper	Held At	Contact
Transport Plan 2011	Southwark Council Environment Public Realm Network Development 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Clement A-Frempong 020 75252305

## APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix A	Recommended proposals
Appendix B	Consultation details: Falmouth Road to Albany Road
Appendix C	Consultation details: Edmund Street to Dog Kennel Hill
Appendix D	Consultation details: Calton Avenue to Crystal Palace
Appendix E	Champion Hill

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Matthew Hill, Head of Highways	
<b>Report Author</b>	Clement Agyei-Frempong, Project Manager	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	11 October 2016	
<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 and Democracy	Yes	Yes
Strategic Director of Finance and Governance	Yes	Yes
<b>Cabinet Member</b>	Yes	Yes
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</b>		11 October 2016