

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 11 May 2015	<b>Decision Taker:</b> Cabinet Member for Environment and the Public Realm
<b>Report title:</b>		Cycling Quietway 14 – Blackfriars Road to Tower Bridge Road	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		Cathedrals, Chaucer, Grange	
<b>From:</b>		Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure	

## RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Cabinet Member for Environment and the Public Realm:

1. Approves the implementation of the cycle route proposals, as detailed in Appendix A, subject to the outcome of the necessary statutory procedures.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. Quietways are a network of radial and orbital cycle routes throughout London. The routes will overcome barriers to cycling, targeting cyclists who want to use quieter, low-traffic routes, providing an environment for these cyclists who want to travel at a more gentle pace.
3. Quietway 14 runs between Southwark and Canada Water. A public consultation has been undertaken covering the Central Grid section which covers the section between Blackfriars Road and Tower Bridge Road.
4. As part of the proposal, a number of traffic movement restrictions would be put in place. This involves:
  - Nicholson Street, to be one-way eastbound for traffic except pedal cycles;
  - Union Street between Great Guildford Street and Southwark Bridge Road to be pedal cycle only except for access, no motor vehicle access to Southwark Bridge Road from Union Street;
  - Newcomen Street closed to motor vehicle traffic at Borough High Street. The section between Borough High Street and Crosby Row to become two-way;
  - Leathermarket Street one-way eastbound only for traffic except cycles; and,
  - Tanner Street one-way westbound only for traffic except cycles.
5. In addition to ensure that the route is suitable throughout the day and night, existing stretches of single yellow line are proposed for upgrading to 24 hour waiting and loading restrictions. A small number of parking bays (7) are proposed for removal at key locations to address road safety concerns.
6. The aims of the scheme are to:
  - Provide a network of continuous and safe cycle routes across inner London;
  - Improve road safety;

- Better conditions for cyclists;
- Improve accessibility for all road users; and,
- Enhance quality of the streetscape.

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

7. Officers undertook initial engagement with ward Councillors and the local residents.
8. Pre-consultation engagement was carried out for the closure of Newcomen Street to gauge the views of local residents / businesses. During this exercise, 99 properties were consulted with seven responses. Officers also spoke to the businesses at the western end of Newcomen Street as part of the exercise. The general consensus was in support of the closure, and that it would transform the environment of the area, providing access / loading was maintained.
9. Outline designs were developed, incorporating the comments from TfL and also fine-tuning the design to ensure the proposed layout was feasible for implementation. See Appendix A for design layout. The key elements progressed to public consultation were as described in paragraphs 4 and 5.
10. Ward Councillors of the affected wards were engaged prior to the public consultation. An Officer presented the proposals to the Councillors and discussed a number of specific items including:
  - The impact on the residents in Edward Edwards' House by the changes in waiting and loading restrictions on Nicholson Street and Dolben Street;
  - Converting single yellow line restrictions to double yellow lines.
  - Impact on surrounding network from point closures on Union Street and Newcomen Street; and proposed one way operation on Leathermarket Street and Tanner Street.

## **Consultation**

11. A public consultation was held in October and November 2015 for the route, from Blackfriars Road to Tower Bridge Road. The consultation started on 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015, initially for a 3 week period. However, after reports that a small number of residents and businesses had not received the leaflets, additional leaflets were distributed and the consultation period extended to 8<sup>th</sup> November 2015 to four weeks in total.
12. Due to the size of the area the scheme covers, it was decided to divide the consultation area into four sections. Each area was based around the likely impact of the proposed measures, thus the size of the sections was varied and the number of leaflets for each area was different. However, each leaflet referenced the other three sections and informed the consultees that information could be found on the Southwark Council website.
13. Two public exhibitions were held on 23 and 26 October 2015 between 2pm and 6pm & 4pm and 8pm respectively. Officers and Council appointed consultants were available at these events to discuss / explain the scheme, as well as answering any questions/queries from attendees.
14. Officers or Council appointed consultants attended additional meetings with

Better Bankside, Edward Edwards' House and Bermondsey Street Area Partnership to discuss the scheme.

15. A total of 4,993 leaflets were delivered as part of the consultation, a total of 374 responses were received, equating to a 7.5% response rate.
16. A detailed consultation report can be found in Appendix B.
17. In summary, within the consultation area, there was overall support for the route.

Section	Scheme area	Leaflet Delivered	No. of Response	Response Rate	Support	Opposed	No answer
A	Nicholson Street, Chancel Street and Dolben Street	319	41	12.9%	24	10	7
					59%	24%	17%
B	Union Street	585	100	17.1%	47	37	16
					47%	37%	16%
C	Newcomen Street, Kipling Street and Guy Street	1,413	74	5.2%	37	29	8
					50%	39%	11%
D	Weston Street, Leathermarket Street and Tanner Street	2,676	159	5.9%	81	51	14
					51%	32%	9%

18. However, there were a number of objections and concerns raised regarding:
  - Increased restrictions on waiting and loading in certain areas;
  - Diversion of local traffic onto other unsuitable roads where closures are proposed;
  - Increase traffic level on other roads and local access difficulty where one-way traffic operation is proposed;
  - Loss of a tree.

### Stakeholder consultation

19. Responses were received from the following stakeholder groups listed below:
  - Southwark Cyclists
  - Southwark Living Streets
  - London Cycle Campaign
  - Better Bankside
  - Bermondsey Street Area Partnership
  - Tabard Gardens North Tenants and Residents Association
20. Southwark Cyclists, Southwark Living Streets, London Cycle Campaign and Better Bankside were all in support of the proposals.
21. Bermondsey Street Area Partnership welcomes improved cycling conditions and reduced traffic in the area but was concerned about the impact on the traffic level in the northern section of Bermondsey Street with the proposed traffic movements on Leathermarket Street and Tanner Street funnelled up Bermondsey Street.

22. Tabard Gardens North TRA did not support the proposal and was concerned about the road network bounded by Newcomen Street and Long Lane.
23. The details of stakeholder responses and officer responses can be found in Appendix B.

### **Community council consultation**

24. As per part 3H of the council's constitution, Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council was consulted on 21 November 2015, while Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Community Council was consulted on 2 December 2015. The following comments were made at these meetings:
  - The outcome of the consultation, including sessions with councillors from across the three wards, was not adequately reflected in the report. The response rate to the consultation was quite low.
  - Concerns had been raised by Guy's Hospital about the plans around Newcomen Street, which also was not reflected in the report.
  - Particular concerns had been raised about Great Suffolk Street, and about the junction of Great Guildford Street and Copperfield Street regarding the safety of cyclists; an alternative route should be found.
  - The Newcomen Street proposal only had 50% support. It would be helpful to know how any further modelling would be received.
  - Concerns regarding the one-way proposals on Leathermarket Street, Morocco Street and Tanner Street. The proposal would have adverse impact on access for local residents on these streets and Bermondsey Street as Bermondsey Street will become the obvious route to exit the area.
25. The following queries were received from Councillor Damien O'Brien from Grange ward:
  - What would happen to ambulance access on Newcomen Street if western end is closed;
  - How local residents would access Morocco Street south of Leathermarket Street. The proposed one-way eastbound on Morocco Street would mean the southern section can only be accessed via Leathermarket Street which involves a very difficult manoeuvre; or via Lamb Walk which is narrow and unsuitable for large vehicles;
  - Access to the hotel on Archie Street and how this interacts with the one-way of Tanner Street;
  - The flow direction of the proposed one-way of Leathermarket Street, Morocco Street and Tanner Street.

### **Response to consultation**

26. Responses to the issues raised during the consultation are detailed in the consultation report in Appendix B. The following responses are provided for the concerns raised in the Community Council meetings.
27. Regarding the outcome of the consultation, including sessions with councillors from the three wards was not adequately reflected in the report. The Community Council Reports summarised the overall results of the consultation. Responses to each question of each of the four leaflets were detailed in the Consultation Report appended to the Community Council report. The session with the ward councillors

mainly focused on presenting the proposed measures along the route. The main comments raised were:

- Parking demand on Nicholson Street for residents of Edward Edwards' House and their visitors;
  - The reason for converting all single yellow lines to double yellow lines;
  - The point closure of Union Street for motorised vehicles between Great Guildford Street and Southwark Bridge Road;
  - The views of the local residents and businesses on the Newcomen Street closure, which was general supportive during the pre-engagement; and,
  - The proposed one-way except cyclists on Leathermarket Street, Morocco Street and Tanner Street. The objections mostly relate to the proposed direction of Tanner Street (westbound) and the subsequent rat-running from Tower Bridge Road to Tooley Street via Bermondsey Street ,
  - In the time between the end of the consultation and the writing of this report, additional objections have been raised to the changing of Snowsfields to one-way eastbound (from westbound), and the changing of Crosby Row to two-way (from one-way southbound).
28. In terms of concerns raised about Guy's Hospital access, under the proposal, Newcomen Street will be closed to motorised traffic at the western end which is currently used by hospital traffic. While traffic will no longer be able to use Newcomen Street to exit onto Borough High Street, hospital vehicles can instead use Crosby Row and Kipling Street, as Snowsfields between Crosby Row and Kipling Street will become eastbound for vehicular traffic only.
29. It should be noted that the changes to Crosby Row and Snowsfields are being undertaken as part of the works to the new Guy's Hospital Cancer Centre (planning application 12/AP/2062) and cannot be changed by the Quietway 14 project. These works are currently intended to be on site and complete before the Quietway.
30. Regarding Great Suffolk Street, there are currently no measures being proposed except at the Union Street junction. Great Guildford Street junction with Copperfield Street is outside the scope of this scheme.
31. The support for the proposed Newcomen Street closure element is 55% overall with 37% objecting. Officer response is that general principle of the proposals, together with those for Snowsfields adjacent to the Guy's Hospital development, is to take non-local through traffic away from the area and onto the surrounding main roads. The amount of traffic diverting onto other minor roads in the area is anticipated to be modest.
32. The proposed one-way operation on Leathermarket Street, Morocco Street and Tanner Street (except pedal cycles) is fundamental to the overall scheme proposals. Given the overall proposals are supported by a majority of respondents, officers believe they should be implemented. However, officers will give further consideration to any detailed issues regarding local access in the detailed design process. One-way operation will be subject to a statutory consultation before implementation giving a further opportunity for local objections to be considered.
33. While it is acknowledged that there is local objection to the proposed direction of Tanner Street, the scheme in this section ties into Transport for London's Road

Network. TfL ran a consultation for a project at the junction of Tanner Street and Tower Bridge Road, that ran from 15 February to 20 March 2016. The results of this consultation are currently unknown. This scheme is based on Tanner Street retaining a westbound traffic flows.

34. The recommendations are consistent with the policies of the Council's Transport Plan 2011, particularly:

Policy 2.3 - promote and encourage sustainable travel choices in the borough  
Policy 5.1 - Improve safety on our roads and to help make all modes of transport safer  
Policy 6.1 – Make our streets more accessible for pedestrians

### **Community impact statement**

35. 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.
36. 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 encouraging cyclists of all levels to use the route and improving safe access to local amenities/shops without any noticeable adverse impact on the vulnerable road users.
37. This scheme is intended to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport.
38. 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.
39. The supplementary proposals on footways, crossings and urban realm improvements will improve the accessibility for pedestrians.

### **Resource implications**

40. Total cost of the proposed scheme is estimated to be £2,000,000. Cost of works will be £1,600,000 and this together with the cost of fees and contingency of £400,000 will be contained within the allocation for 2015/16 and 2016/17 Cycling Grid budget funded by Transport for London (TfL).
41. Some of the budgets required to meet the above costs are already budgeted on the council's financial information system and the remaining budgets will be loaded once TfL's full allocation for the scheme is confirmed on the TfL's portal system. The works will not be commissioned until such time as sufficient budgets have been formally confirmed.
42. All costs arising from implementing the recommendations will be fully contained within the existing budgets, which are funded by Transport for London.
43. Any future maintenance costs arising from this investment will be funded from existing Asset Management Business Unit revenue maintenance budgets.

44. Staffing and any other costs connected with this recommendation to be contained with existing business unit budgets.

### **Consultation**

45. Consultation details are outlined in the key issues section above, with a detailed consultation report included at Appendix B.
46. Parts of the scheme require Traffic Management Orders. The procedure for implementing a TMO involves a statutory consultation which will follow this decision being taken. 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 the subject of a further IDM report to the Cabinet Member for Environment and the Public Realm.

### **SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS**

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

47. The cabinet member for Environment and the Public Realm is being asked to approve the implementation of the Central London Cycling Grid Quietway 14.
48. Part of the scheme requires a traffic management order. The process for implementing a traffic management order involves a statutory consultation procedure pursuant to the Road Traffic Regulations 1984 and the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) Regulations 1996. 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 the subject of a further IDM report to the Cabinet Member for Environment and the Public Realm.
49. 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.
50. 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).
51. The proposals of the Central London Cycling Grid Quietway 14 are not anticipated to have an adverse effect on the equalities and human rights of any individual or group.
52. The Council's constitution gives the cabinet member the responsibility for, amongst other things, traffic management and road safety. This decision therefore falls within the cabinet member's area of responsibility.

**Strategic Director of Finance and Governance (CAP15/214)**

53. The report is requesting approval from the Cabinet Member for Environment and the Public Realm to implement the Central London Cycling Grid Quietway 14.
54. It is noted that the total cost of the proposed scheme including fees and contingency is estimated to be £2m and funded from the allocation for 2015/16 and 2016/17 Cycling Grid budget funded by Transport for London (TfL). It is also noted that the works will not be commissioned until such time as sufficient budgets have been confirmed on the TfL portal system and reflected on the council's financial information system.
55. Officers should ensure that the scheme is completed within the time limit set by TfL for the grant funding.
56. It is also noted that any future maintenance costs arising from this investment will be funded from existing departmental revenue budgets.
57. Staffing and any other costs connected with this recommendation to be contained with existing departmental revenue budgets.

**APPENDICES**

No.	Title
Appendix A	Proposed Layout
Appendix B	Consultation Report

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Transport Plan 2011 Cycle Strategy	Southwark Council Environment Public Realm Network Development 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Matt Hill 020 7525 3541

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Matthew Hill, Head of Highways		
<b>Report Author</b>	Ian Ransom, Group Manager		
<b>Version</b>	Final		
<b>Dated</b>	11 May 2016		
<b>Key Decision?</b>	Yes	<b>If yes, date appeared on forward plan</b>	March 2016
<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>Date final report sent to Constitutional Support Services</b>		10 May 2016	