

<b>Item No.</b> 17.	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 13 September 2016	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Community Council
<b>Report title:</b>		South Sea Street Emergency Access	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		Surrey Docks	
<b>From:</b>		Head of Highways	

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Community Council approve the implementation of double yellow line waiting restrictions at the southern end of South Sea Street, subject to the necessary statutory procedures.
2. That Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Community Council approve the implementation of a no-motor-vehicles zone at the southern end of South Sea Street, subject to the necessary statutory procedures, excepting for public service vehicles and emergency services vehicles.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

3. Several residents in the area had issued complaints to the council regarding the existing gate at the junction of South Sea Street and Rope Street. The presence of the gate was intended as a physical measure to prevent non-emergency vehicles from passing between South Sea Street and Rope Street.
4. The nature of the complaints are based around the gate being continually left open, thus providing an unintended short cut through the highway network, and the increased vehicle speeds and volumes that result from this.
5. The existing highway infrastructure is not being used as intended, and the proposals put forward are formalising the existing restriction and making it more effective.
6. In accordance with Part 3H paragraphs 20 and 22 of the Southwark constitution, community councils are to make decisions regarding the introduction of short lengths of waiting and loading restrictions, and to hear and determine traffic petitions and deputations that are of a nonstrategic nature.
7. A report detailing the original complaints, the consultation method and results, and the general arrangement drawing of the proposals can be found in Appendix A.

## KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

8. Ward Councillors for Surrey Docks were made aware of the scheme and the consultation process on 22 December 2015.

9. A full closure of the route was considered, however the London Fire Brigade requested that the access for emergency vehicles was maintained.
10. Residents were not asked to complete a questionnaire, but were encouraged to respond with any objections to the proposals. The letters outlining the proposals were delivered on 12 May 2016 and the deadline for objections was 31 May 2016.
11. One of the contact details on the letter was incorrect. In the interests of conducting a fair consultation process, the letter was reissued and the deadline for objections was extended by two weeks, to 17 June 2016.
12. As of 1 June 2016, 14 responses had been received, including 6 objections. Further detailing of the objections is given in Appendix A – Consultation Report.

	<i>Local Response*</i>	<i>Non-Local Response*</i>	<i>TOTAL</i>
Response Rate	22.7%	N/A	31.8%
Fully Support	4 (40%)	1 (25%)	5 (36%)
Partially Support	3 (30%)	0	3 (21%)
Fully Object	3 (30%)	3 (75%)	6 (43%)
TOTAL	10	4	14

*\* It should be stressed that while the term “non-local” is used in the above table, all responses were from addresses located within nearby roads.*

13. The three “partially support” responses were in favour of not allowing vehicles to pass between South Sea Street and Rope Street, objecting to the additional waiting and loading restrictions and the extent of the restricted area. Responses to objections, and reasons that this is not possible, are given in Appendix A – consultation report.
14. The response to the proposals has been varied. Although there does not appear to be a clear consensus, officers are of the view that the proposals should go ahead, considering that the consultation was undertaken on the basis of formalising an existing restriction rather than creating a new one, and therefore given that there is no clear consensus to remove the restriction, it should be retained and formalised.
15. Officers have considered all comments from respondents, and have deemed that there are a mixture of legal, policy and engineering reasons that the alternative suggestions are not feasible.

### **Policy implications**

16. The recommendations contained within this report are consistent with the policies of the Transport Plan 2011, particularly:
  - Policy 1.1 – Pursue overall traffic reduction
  - 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.
  - Policy 8.1 – Seek to reduce overall levels of private motor vehicle traffic on our streets

### **Community impact statement**

17. 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.
18. The implementation of this traffic restriction would improve the quality of life for local residents as the speed and volume of vehicles in the area (and also in surrounding roads) should decrease.
19. Some residents will experience longer journeys by motor vehicle.
20. It is hoped that by reducing the overall speed and volume of motor traffic throughout all of South Sea Street and Rope Street, road users would feel safer and be encouraged to walk or cycle for shorter journeys.
21. The scheme will result in a loss of two (informal, unmarked) parking spaces.

### **Resource implications**

22. The proposals would be funded by council capital and are expected to cost £8,000 to implement.
23. The enforcement of the restriction would be undertaken by the council's parking enforcement team.

### **Consultation**

24. Ward members and emergency services were consulted prior to commencement of the consultation.
25. Informal public consultation with local residents was carried out in May and June 2016, as detailed above.
26. If approved for implementation this restriction will be subject to statutory consultation required in the making of any permanent traffic management orders.

### **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

<b>Background Papers</b>	<b>Held At</b>	<b>Contact</b>
Transport Plan 2011	Southwark Council Environment Public Realm Network Development 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH Online: <a href="http://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/200107/transport_policy/1947/southwark_transport_plan_2011">http://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/200107/transport_policy/1947/southwark_transport_plan_2011</a>	Matthew Hill 020 7525 3541

## APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix A	South Sea Street Emergency Access – Consultation Report

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Matthew Hill, Head of Highways	
<b>Report Author</b>	David Newman, Project Manager	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	31 August 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	No	No
Strategic Director of Finance and Governance	No	No
Cabinet Member	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</b>		31 August 2016