Item No. 13.	Classification: Open	Date: 22 June 2016	Meeting Name: Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Community Council
Report title:		Rotherhithe Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) Study	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		Rotherhithe, Surrey Docks	
From:		Head of Highways	

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the community council comment upon the proposed consultation boundary and methods to review parking arrangements within a network of streets bounded by Elephant Lane, the B205 Brunel Road, Surrey Water and the River Thames adjacent to the existing CPZs 'H' and 'G'.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2. Part 3H of the council's constitution provides that community councils should be consulted on strategic traffic management matters such as whether to change the times of operation of a parking zone and the related method of consultation.
- 3. This consultation has been proposed following comments received during the 2015-16 consultation in the Canada Water area which resulted in the existing Zone 'H' being extended to several adjacent roads.
- 4. Parking stress data from the 2015-16 review also shows high levels of parking stress within the study area.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

- 5. The consultation method for the parking zone review is detailed in Appendix 1 which includes a plan showing the proposed study boundary.
- 6. Before a final decision is taken, the community council will again be consulted. The procedure is summarised in the table below and full details on the process are contained within Appendix 1.

Phase		Expected dates
Survey & consultation	Consultation pack and questionnaire to all residents, businesses and stakeholders	September 2016
Decision	Draft report to community council	Early 2017
making	Final report to Cabinet Member for Environment and the Public	
	Realm	
Delivery	Statutory consultation and Implementation	Spring 2017

Policy implications

- 7. The recommendations contained within this report are consistent with the polices of the Transport Plan 2011, particularly:
 - Policy 1.1 pursue overall traffic reduction;
 - Policy 4.2 create places that people can enjoy; and
 - Policy 8.1 seek to reduce overall levels of private motor vehicle traffic on our streets

Community impact statement

- 8. The policies within the transport plan are upheld within this report and have been subject to an equality impact assessment.
- 9. The recommendations are area based and therefore will have greatest affect upon those people living, working or traveling in the vicinity of the areas where the proposals are made.
- 10. The introduction or amendment of a parking zone contributes to an improved environment through the elimination of on-street commuter parking and the associated reduction of local and borough-wide traffic levels.
- 11. 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 recommendations have been implemented and observed.
- 12. With the exception of those benefits and risks identified above, the recommendations are not considered to have a disproportionate effect on any other community or group.
- 13. The recommendations do not conflict with the council's commitment to equalities or to the protection of human rights. In addition, part of the aim of the consultation is to promote social inclusion by:
 - providing improved access for key services such as emergency and refuse vehicles; and
 - improving road safety, in particular for vulnerable road users on the public highway.
- 14. The consultation leaflets will meet communication guidance with a languages page providing advice as to how to access the council's translation service. Furthermore, large format leaflets will be available for those with visual impairment.

Resource implications

- 15. The costs of the parking zone project, including staff fees, consultation and implementation (if supported) will cost approximately £50,000 which will be funded through capital provisions already established for this purpose.
- 16. A more accurate estimate of the costs from this scheme will be reported at the end of the consultation.

Legal implications

- 17. The community councils are being asked to comment upon the proposed consultation boundary and methods for the Rotherhithe parking study. Community councils are entitled to consider these issues pursuant to paragraph 3H of the council's constitution.
- 18. 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. It is not envisaged that the consultation referred to in this report will conflict with the requirements of the Act.
- 19. 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. It is not envisaged that the consultation referred to in this report will conflict with any of the protected rights.

Consultation

- 20. Consultation on the outline of the project has been carried out with the cabinet member for environment and the public realm.
- 21. All aspects of future consultation are detailed in Appendix 1.

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Inception report

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Transport Plan 2011	online:	Paul Gellard
	www.southwark.gov.uk/info/200107/transport_	020 7525 7764
	policy/1947/southwark_transport_plan_2011	

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Matthew Hill, Head of Highways				
Report Author	Jonathan Fish, Project Engineer				
Version	Final				
Dated	7 June 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		No	No		
Governance					
Cabinet Member		No	No		
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team7 June 2016			7 June 2016		