

<b>Item No.</b> 17.	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 6 February 2016	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Peckham and Nunhead Community Council
<b>Report title:</b>		Estate Parking Scheme – Monteagle Way	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		The Lane ward	
<b>From:</b>		Head of Operations	

### **RECOMMENDATION**

1. It is recommended that the following local traffic and parking amendments, are approved for implementation subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory procedures:
  - Monteagle Way – to be included in the estate parking scheme

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

2. Part 3H of the Southwark constitution delegates decision making for non-strategic traffic management matters to the community council.
3. 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 road markings
  - the setting of consultation boundaries for consultation on traffic schemes
  - the introduction of disabled parking bays
  - statutory objections to origin disabled parking bays.
4. This report gives recommendation for a local traffic and parking amendment, involving the implementation of an enforcement and estate parking scheme.
5. The origins and reasons for the recommendations are discussed within the key issues section of this report.

### **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

6. The area housing team was contacted by the resident representatives from Monteagle Way. The residents of the street (which is a cul-de-sac) discussed parking problems with the resident officer and asked to be balloted in regard to implementing a parking permit scheme.
7. The resident representatives identified a need for controlled parking on the cul-de-sac.

8. The resident representatives explained that it was difficult for residents to park on Monteagle Way.
9. The residents believe most of the vehicles belong to non-residents and commuters and are parking all day.
10. The resident officer undertook a ballot on the cul-de-sac. Questionnaires were delivered to 34 households and 19 responses were received by the south area housing team. From the responses, 12 households voted in favour of the parking scheme and 7 households voted against it.
11. Based on the results of the responses, it has been agreed that Monteagle Way would like to be included in the parking permit scheme.
12. The permit scheme is for residents only and visitor permits are allowed.
13. The enforcement period favoured by residents is Monday to Sunday, 24 hours.
14. Having a parking scheme on the cul-de-sac will ensure only residents and their visitors are entitled to park on the parking spaces available.
15. There is no current parking permit scheme for Monteagle Way.
16. It is therefore recommended to introduce a parking enforcement scheme to assist residents and prevent commuter parking in the cul-de-sac.

### **Community impact statement**

17. The recommendations are area based and therefore will have greatest affect upon non-residents and non-visitors of those areas where the proposals are made.
18. The introduction of the parking scheme will benefit residents of the cul-de-sac and their visitors.
19. With the exception of those benefits and risks identified above, the recommendations are not considered to have a disproportionate affect on any other community or group.
20. 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**

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

## **Legal implications**

22. Traffic Management Orders would be made under powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984.
23. 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.
24. 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.
25. 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.
26. 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.
27. 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**

28. No informal (public) consultation has been carried out.
29. Where consultation with stakeholders has been completed, this is described within the key issues section of the report.
30. Should the community council approve the items, statutory consultation will take place as part of the making of the traffic management order. The process for statutory consultation is defined by national regulations.
31. The council will place a proposal notice in proximity to the site location and also publish the notice in the Southwark News and the London Gazette.
32. The notice and any associated documents and plans will also be made available for inspection on the council's website or by appointment at its 160 Tooley Street office.
33. Any person wishing to comment upon or object to the proposed order will have 21 days in which to do so.

34. Should an objection be made that officers are unable to informally resolve, this objection will be reported to the community council for determination, in accordance with the Southwark constitution.

#### BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
None		

#### APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Map location

#### AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Paul Langford, Head of Operations	
<b>Report Author</b>	Olayinka Akinsola, Resident Services Manager	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	16 November 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 and 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>	15 January 2016	