

Item No. 15.	Classification: Open	Date: 21 March 2016	Meeting Name: Peckham and Nunhead Community Council
Report title:		Ivydale Traffic Calming Review	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		Nunhead	
From:		Head of Highways	

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That Peckham and Nunhead Community Council consider and reject the seven objections received to the proposals due to the essential nature of the additional waiting restrictions to ensure the proposals operate safely and effectively.
2. That the community council instruct officers to make the traffic order, notify the objectors and implement the scheme.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

3. Part 3H of the Southwark Constitution delegates decision making for the cleaner, greener, safer (CGS) capital programme to community councils.
4. Part 3H of the Southwark Constitution sets out that the community council will take decisions on non-strategic matters relating to traffic management
5. Funding has been secured through the council's cleaner, greener, safer (CGS) programme to review existing traffic calming on Ivydale Road, between Linden Grove and Lanbury Road. This is due to complaints by residents living close to the speed tables. Concerns were raised about the environmental nuisance caused by the humps when used by motorists, noise, vibration and perceived structural disturbance to their properties.
6. This report details the results of a statutory consultation undertaken as part of revised proposals to replace the raised tables with a priority working system.
7. The objectives of the scheme are to:
 - Provide less environmentally intrusive traffic calming, by replacing existing vertical traffic calming (raised tables) on Ivydale Road, between Linden Grove and Lanbury Road, with horizontal traffic calming (road narrowing) and priority system.
 - Provide more effective vertical traffic calming between the raised tables.
 - Allow large vehicles to safely pass one another.
 - Improve safety at junctions along Ivydale Road.
8. The elements of the scheme are to:
 - Provide widened footway buildouts to narrow the road where raised tables are being removed to compensate for the potential loss in vertical traffic calming.

- Introduce a give-way / priority system to replace raised tables and provide the associated signing.
 - Extend existing waiting restrictions as required to accommodate vehicle swept paths.
 - Remove a number of speed cushions and replace them with sinusoidal road humps.
 - Extend waiting restrictions at specific junctions.
9. Ivydale Road is a local residential street which is busy with buses, local and through traffic accessing local amenities along the road eg Nunhead Station, schools, churches etc.
 10. The existing traffic calming scheme on Ivydale Road was introduced as part of Nunhead 20mph zone scheme in 2010. Traffic calming measures for the section of Ivydale Road, between Linden Grove and Athenlay Road, are a combination of speed cushions and road narrowing's (footway buildouts) incorporating raised tables. The southern section of Ivydale Road, towards Cheltenham Road, currently has road narrowings with give-way/priority system to restrain traffic speeds but without raised features.
 11. The CGS funding was provided to specifically review the road narrowings incorporating raised tables on the section between Linden Grove and Lanbury Road, but not the section south of Lanbury Road. Over the last few years some residents of Ivydale Road, particularly those living close to these raised tables have complained about the impact of the humps on the quality of their life, with noise, vibration, environmental nuisance and perceived structural damage to their property quoted, particularly when the speed tables are traversed by lorries and buses.
 12. A site visit between council officers, residents and a ward councillor was held in September 2014. The aim was to inform project officers of residents' aspiration for the impending traffic calming review. This would then inform the scheme development. It was clear from residents who attended that they would like to see the speed tables removed. Officers were asked to explore similar traffic calming measures to those operating at the southern end of Ivydale Road i.e. road narrowing with alternating priority but no raised features.
 13. Based on the feedback from the site visit, officers proposed the following changes to address residents' concerns:
 - Remove existing speed tables at locations shown on the plan in Appendix B.
 - Narrow the carriageway at locations where the raised tables are to be removed from the current 4.0m to 3.2m to compensate for the traffic calming impact lost by the removal of raised features.
 - Introduce a give-way / priority system as a form of traffic calming and regulate traffic flows. Priority will alternate along the road.
 - Extend existing double yellow lines at some locations to allow adequate waiting and passing gaps and to ensure adequate visibility for pedestrians at side road junctions
 14. The proposed changes will not address existing concerns about traffic congestion on this northern section of Ivydale Road, which is generally narrower, compared to Cheltenham Road, south of Ivydale Road. The existing road layout and kerbside parking at the northern section of Ivydale Road leaves an effective road width of 5.0-

5.5 metres for two-way traffic. This is not wide enough for two buses to pass each other at any time, hence the need for waiting gaps. However, this can be achieved by increasing the length of the double yellow lines.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

15. In order to maintain the traffic calming effect once the raised tables are removed at these locations, the width of the buildouts will be narrowed from 4m to 3.2m. This dimension is critical as it discourages traffic from overtaking cyclists (and vice versa) and also a sufficient width to accommodate buses and refuse vehicles.
16. Ivydale Road forms part of bus route P12 with 6 services an hour in each direction at peak times.
17. For the proposed give-way/ priority system to work safely and effectively, adequate waiting areas are required as the effective carriageway width is not enough for two buses to pass each other at any time. Therefore, the proposed extension of the double yellow lines will need to be of sufficient length to allow two opposing buses (or a bus and a refuse vehicle) to pass each other in the vicinity of the buildouts. Refer to Appendix B for details of proposed layout.
18. It is proposed that the existing double yellow lines at the sections where traffic will give-way at the priority system be extended to a total length of 25m from the edge of buildout, and the existing double yellow lines where traffic has priority are retained between 7 to 10 metres.
19. Five sinusoidal profile road humps will be installed to replace speed cushions to make the route more cycle friendly while restraining traffic speeds.
20. Following the completion of the detailed design, a statutory consultation was undertaken on Ivydale Road between 18 February and 10 March 2016.
21. A total of ten responses were received during the statutory consultation period. Three responses were in support and seven objections were received to the proposed scheme (see Appendix A). The objections were mainly concerned with the resulting loss of parking spaces due to the extension of the double yellow lines at the buildouts. The objections and the Officer response are summarised in the table below.

Objections	Officers Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objecting on the grounds of excessive parking loss. • If the give way direction was reversed at our part of Ivydale Road then the longer yellow line section would run outside the Church to no 145. There is already a driveway with a white h-bar in this zone, so you could save at least one parking space. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The double yellow lines at the buildouts are required in order for the priority system to work safely and effectively. As Ivydale Road forms part of a bus route there will need to be a sufficient passing space to allow two opposing buses, or a bus and a refuse vehicle to safely pass each other. • For the priority system to work effectively along the length of the scheme, the priority system would

Objections	Officers Response
	<p>have to be reversed at each buildout to establish priority for opposing traffic, which would impact other properties. However, in determining the direction of priority, consideration is given to a number of factors including traffic speeds, accident statistics and traffic volume</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are concerned that the double yellow lines have been extended further than they are currently. We do not see any justification for this. The main issue is the major issue caused by the reduced residents parking. • Residents would like to see controlled hours rather than a double yellow at pinch points - we believe restricted parking between hours of 8am - 7pm would be sufficient as the rest of the time the road is quiet and two buses can pass each other easily. This allows residents to park outside these their houses overnight, whilst ensuring the traffic calming measures are effective when needed. • We would also like restricted parking to be considered for residents only, to help with the issue of parking. • We would also like to see average speed cameras for the whole area to ensure that people comply with the 20mph zone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The double yellow lines have only been extended at the give-way side of the buildouts in order to have an adequate waiting area to allow two opposing buses to safely pass each other. No changes are proposed on the side where approaching vehicles have priority. • The P12 service runs six to seven services an hour during peak times (in both directions) and operates between 6.50am and 00.28. The priority system needs to be operational at all times hence a 24hour restriction is being proposed. • This is not in the current forward programme for Parking Zones however can be logged for future investigation. • There are strict criteria to be met to justify the installation of speed cameras in order to maintain their effectiveness. Ivydale Road will need to be assessed to see if it qualifies for the installation of speed cameras

Objections	Officers Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I object to this proposal on two key grounds. First, it is certain to reduce the amount of parking available on Ivydale Road, where there are already serious problems. • Second, there is a very low probability that the scheme will actually deliver traffic calming so you are trading a certain dis-benefit for an uncertain benefit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed parking loss is to ensure larger vehicles can safely pass each other and also provide waiting gaps for traffic giving way. • The give way system will establish a clear priority and regulate traffic flow along Ivydale Road. The current layout does not have any formal provision to encourage traffic to give way on the approach to the pinch points and may encourage aggressive driving especially during peak times.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed double yellow lines will result in many residents and visitors (particularly the congregation of the Seventh Day Adventist Church) being forced to park on the double yellow lines, as many already do, thus increasing the problem of congestion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The double yellow lines indicate a prohibition of waiting at any time even if there are no upright signs. The proposed double yellow line restrictions at the buildouts will be enforceable everyday including Sundays and Bank holidays
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are further concerned with the removal of the raised pinch points, as these provide a safer place for residents and children to cross giving them better visibility in each direction. The residents would like to see the raised pinch points remaining, albeit narrowed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The buildouts have been widened, therefore reducing the crossing distance for pedestrians making it relatively quicker and safer to cross the road. The extension of the double yellow lines will maintain adequate site lines for approaching traffic to improve conditions for pedestrians.

Consultation

22. A public consultation was undertaken in Ivydale Road between 1-19 December 2014 where 365 leaflets were delivered and a total of 44 responses were received during the period. 79.5% of respondents were in favour of removing the tables, 56.8% supported narrowing of the pinch points, while 50% did not favour the priority system with double yellow lines.

Policy implications

23. The recommendation to implement the proposals contained within this report is consistent with the policies of the Council's Transport Plan 2011, particularly:

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.

Community impact statement

24. The proposal is intended to maintain the existing level of traffic calming whilst ensuring local residents do not suffer the perceived side-effects of the present scheme.
25. The scheme will not have a significant impact on walking and cycling levels but will help cyclists with the installation of cycle friendly sinusoidal humps. It should also improve bus services by avoiding occurrences of buses having difficulty in negotiating the pinch points or coming into conflict with larger vehicles especially during peak times. The measures are also expected to regulate traffic flow without the need for the raised features at the pinch points.

Resource implications

26. The project is funded by CGS for £6,750. S106 funding of £7,000 is also earmarked. The estimated cost of works is £50,000. The development cost is £15,000. The scheme cost is therefore intended to be contained with budget allocated.
27. The cost of the proposed traffic management order scheme is £3,312 and will be contained within the £6,750 allocated budget funded by CGS.

Consultation

28. A statutory consultation was undertaken in March 2016 to make the changes in Section 5 permanent. Seven representations were received – see Appendix A.

REASON FOR URGENCY

29. The cleaner greener safer funding is time-limited to two years, not reporting until the next community council meeting would put the overall programme and funding at risk and undermine confidence by some residents. The project has already been pushed back a year and this is already causing concerns among some residents.

REASON FOR LATENESS

30. The objection period for the statutory consultation ended 10 March 2016, which was a day before deadline for agenda despatch.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Transport Plan 2011	Southwark Council Environment Public Realm Network Development 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Clement A- Frempong 020 7525 2305

APPENDICES

No	Title
Appendix A	Representation from statutory consultation
Appendix B	Proposed layout
Appendix C	Location plan

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Matthew Hill, Head of Highways	
Report Author	Clement Agyei-Frempong, Project Manager	
Version	Final	
Dated	17 March 2016	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Director of Law and Democracy	No	No
Strategic Director of Finance and Governance	No	No
Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure	No	No
Cabinet Member	No	No
Date final report sent to the Constitutional Team	18 March 2016	