RECOMMENDATIONS

Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport Management & Air Quality:

1. Approves the implementation of the highway improvement scheme at Hampton Street and Steedman Street, Newington and North Walworth Wards as per the drawing in Appendix A subject to detail design, road safety audit and the outcome of the necessary statutory consultation.

2. Acknowledges the desire from consultees to allow contraflow cycling on the eastern half of Hampton Street and approves the additional implementation of that facility as part of the project, subject to design, road safety audit, budget and the outcome of the necessary statutory procedures.

3. Acknowledge the desire from a local business to alter the proposed parking layout on Steedman Street, under the railway bridge, and approves the additional implementation of two new shared use bays in place of the existing permit holders bays as part of the project, subject to the outcome of the necessary statutory procedures.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

4. The project is part of a wider regeneration programme for the Elephant and Castle area and seeks to improve the public realm in the local area as well as improve the walking and cycling links from Walworth Road to the Newington Estate.

5. The improvements will be delivered using Section 106 funding of £302,330 released in October 2016 for public realm improvements to Hampton and Steedman Streets.

6. The report detailing the source of the funds and the decision to release them for use to deliver public realm improvements can be found here: [http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/documents/s64272/Report To release 302330.13 from s106 agreements to deliver public realm enhancements to Hampton.pdf](http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/documents/s64272/Report To release 302330.13 from s106 agreements to deliver public realm enhancements to Hampton.pdf)

7. The objectives of the Hampton and Steedman Streets Improvement Scheme are to:
   - Improve pedestrian comfort
   - Improve conditions for cycling
- Reduce motor vehicle speeds
- Reduce street clutter
- Reduce collisions
- Improve routes for pedestrians

8. In the three years from 01 January 2014 to 31 December 2016, there were two collisions in the immediate project area. In both of these collisions, the casualty was slightly injured. During the same period there were a further three collisions adjacent to the scope of works, including one serious casualty. These occurred at the junctions with Walworth Road.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

9. The improvements will be delivered using Section 106 funding of £302,330 released in October 2016 for public realm improvements in Newington ward.

10. In October 2016, an initial meeting was organised with residents from the Newington and Draper estates to define a brief for the project. The Council then sought the views of residents, businesses, and stakeholders in July 2017 of a proposal to widen and resurface the footway of Hampton Street, and widen in part the northern footway of Steedman Street.

11. While the responses were mostly positive, feedback suggested that businesses using Hampton Street would be negatively impacted and the objections were unable to be resolved. The feedback was incorporated into a new design, with the focus of the project shifting to Steedman Street.

12. There was interest from consultation respondents to allow contraflow cycling on Hampton Street. Officers consider this to be a feasible suggestion which should be implemented subject to a road safety audit and statutory consultation. The Cabinet Member is being asked to approve the implementation of contraflow cycling on Hampton Street.

13. There was interest from one business to replace one of the existing permit holder parking bays on Steedman Street, underneath the railway line, with a disabled bay. Officers consider a more suitable layout to be two shared use bays, which creates two bays in which disabled people may park while also allowing resident permit holders to park.

14. The Cabinet Member is being asked to approve the implementation of two shared use bays on Steedman Street.

15. Newington ward councillors, residents, businesses, key and local stakeholders were consulted on the developed proposals between 29 January and 18 February 2018. A total of 132 letters were distributed to residents and businesses, directing them to the Council’s website to view plans and complete an online questionnaire.

Consultation

16. Only seven responses were received via the online questionnaire, which represents a response rate of 0.5%. This may be due to the previous engagement exercises already undertaken, with many respondents feeling that their views have already been put forward.
17. One further response was received via e-mail, and one via letter. These comments were taken into consideration, but are not included in the figures below as it is not certain whether the resident was in support of the scheme or not.

18. Consultees were asked to classify their support of the proposals into one of five options. Respondents did not have to answer this question in order to complete the questionnaire. The result is summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Fully Support</th>
<th>Partly Support</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Partly Disagree</th>
<th>Fully Disagree</th>
<th>Did Not Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Respondents were also given the opportunity to write free text comments. The supportive comments can be summarized as:

- Better street appearance / public realm
- Parking reduction
- Better walking and cycling facilities and experience
- Priority given to pedestrians
- Raised traffic calming features
- New street trees *
- Improved street lighting **

* New street trees were not shown on the plans and will be dependent on underground investigation
** The street lighting has already been improved and no further improvements were proposed.

20. Respondents were asked what features they did not like about the proposals. The negative comments can be summarized (with responses in italics) as:

- A lack of proposals at Hampton Street, Wollaston Road junction is too wide. *Due to the size of vehicles that access and egress Wollaston Road, albeit relatively infrequently, it was not possible to tighten the junction. Several businesses objected to the narrowed carriageway due to servicing and loading requirements.*

- Removal of the feeder lane to Advance Stop Line (ASL) for cycles. **DS 303 of the Southwark Streetscape Design Manual states that “existing feeder lanes leading into ASLs … should be reviewed with a view to removal”. While the Council recognises that there is the potential for some cycles to be unable to reach the ASL, the provision of a feeder lane would require either a narrower footway (less than 2.0m wide) or a sub-standard narrow feeder lane (1.2m wide).**

- A lack of light segregation / protection for the contraflow cycle lane. *The Council has undertaken swept path analyses of the types of vehicles*
that use Steedman Street. Due to the numerous vehicle crossovers, segregation was not possible.

- The contraflow cycle lane needs to be widened
  *The contraflow cycle lane is proposed to be widened from 1.4 to 1.5 metres*

- The road width of 3.9m at Steedman Street is dangerous when cycles and motor vehicles meet
  *The existing road width at this location is 3.9m (with 2m wide parking bays) and has been historically. The occupancy of these parking spaces is high and given the low speeds and volumes of motor vehicle traffic, the risk and severity of a collision is deemed to be low.*

- Hampton Street should allow contraflow cycling
  *This will be investigated for feasibility and implemented if possible as part of the project.*

- Make Steedman Street two-way to remove signs and road markings
  *As above, the existing parking spaces are in high demand. Even though traffic flows are low, the road is not wide enough to accommodate this.*

- Paving over the island that protects the existing contraflow cycle lane
  *The island is proposed to be reduced in width to accommodate wider footway and contraflow cycle lane, which would negatively affect the health of any plants. However, we will consider these widths further at detail design stage.*

- The four proposed cycle stands should be spread out
  *This will be considered at detail design stage*

- Vehicle speeds on Hampton Street
  *The addition of a raised table should keep speeds low. Traffic counts have shown that speeds are lower than 20mph. Interventions on Hampton Street were limited due to the requirements of businesses.*

**Stakeholder consultation**

21. Newington Ward Councillors were issued the plans on 26 January 2018 for comment, and then again on 5 February 2018 once the consultation was live. No comments or objections were received.

22. The emergency services were issued the plans on 6 November 2017 for comment. The Police were overall supportive of the scheme, however raised a concern that some cyclists may attempt to squeeze past stationary traffic to reach the ASL.

*The Southwark Streetscape Design Manual requires the use of ASLs and also encourages the removal of feeder lanes.*

23. The following groups and organisations were also consulted:

- Southwark Living Streets
- Newington TRA
- Southwark Cyclists
- Wheels for Wellbeing
• Guide Dogs UK Charity for the Blind and Partially Sighted
• Southwark Disablement Association
• Latin American Disabled People’s Project
• OBAC (Organisation of Blind Africans and Carribeans)
• SELVIS (South East London Vision)
• Blackfriars Settlement

24. None of the above groups responded in an official capacity, although some representatives did use the online form to respond personally.

25. One local business requested that a disabled bay is provided beneath the railway bridge on Steedman Street.

Community Council

26. The Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council was not consulted on the proposals. Non strategic schemes are not required to go to community council unless referred by Ward Councillors.

Policy implications

27. The recommendations are consistent with the policies of the council’s Transport Plan 2011, particularly:

• Policy 1.8 – improve the walking environment and ensure that people have the information and confidence to use it.

• Policy 1.10 - Improve the cycling environment and ensure that people have the information and confidence to use it.

• Policy 1.12 - Ensure that cycle parking is provided in areas of high demand and in areas where convenient.

• 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/equalities

28. 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.

29. This scheme was identified as one which would help to deliver the council’s aim of increasing walking levels in the borough by improving the footways, in both width and surface quality.

30. 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.

Resource implications

31. Total cost of the proposed scheme is estimated to be £302,330. Cost of works will be approximately £255,000 and this together with the cost of fees and contingency of approximately £45,000 will be contained within the aforementioned S106 funding for public realm improvements in the area.

32. All costs arising from implementing the recommendations will be fully contained within the existing budgets, which are funded by released S106 contributions.

33. Any future maintenance costs arising from this investment will be funded from existing revenue maintenance budgets.

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

35. Any future requirement to undertake enforcement of the traffic management order is expected to be self-sustaining.

Consultation

36. Consultation details are outlined in the key issues section above, with all nine responses provided in full, personal details redacted, in Appendix B.

37. 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

The Director of Law and Democracy

38. The cabinet member for Environment and the Public Realm is being asked to approve the implementation of the Hampton and Steedman Streets Improvements. The funding for these works has already been approved by the council’s Planning Committee.

39. 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.

40. 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.

41. The proposals of the Hampton and Steedman Streets Improvements are considered between paragraphs 24 and 26 of the report and are not anticipated to have an adverse effect either on the equalities of any group with protected characteristics or on any human rights as protected by the Human Rights act 1998 of any individual.

42. 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 Corporate Services (CAP15/214)

43. The report is requesting approval from the cabinet member for Environment and the Public Realm to implement the Hampton and Steedman Streets Improvements, subject to detail design, road safety audit and the outcome of the necessary statutory procedures. Full details are contained within the main body of the report.

44. It is noted that the total cost of the proposed scheme including fees and contingency is estimated to be £302,330 and funded from various S106 contributions.

45. It is also noted that any future maintenance costs arising from this investment will be funded from existing departmental revenue budgets.

46. Staffing and any other costs connected with this recommendation to be contained with existing departmental revenue budgets.
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