



COMMUNITY COUNCILS
A voice for your community



Dulwich Community Council

2

Draft Minutes of
Dulwich Community Council meeting held on Wednesday 29th June 2005
At Christ Church, 263 Barry Road, SE22

Present

Councillors Toby Eckersley (Chair), Kim Humphreys, David Bradbury, Michelle Pearce, Sarah Welfare, William Rowe

1. Introduction and welcome by the Chair

Cllr Eckersley introduced himself, Council Members, Council officers and welcomed people to the meeting.

2. Apologies

Apologies were received from Cllrs Charlie Smith and Lewis Robinson (Vice Chair)

3. Disclosure of Members' interests and dispensations

There were none.

4. Urgent Items

There were none.

5. Minutes of previous meetings

Amendment to minutes of 11 May 2005:

Page 10 – should read John Payne (Chairman of Crystal Palace Community Association): has been pressing for traffic and speed restrictions in Dulwich Wood Avenue and Jasper Road and these will cost £28K.

With this amendment the minutes were agreed and signed by the Chair.

The Chair reported there was an error in the minutes of **9 March 2005** – on page 3, Andy Doidge said governors **were** opposed to proposals to build out pavements outside of Goodrich school.

5.1 Matters Arising from the previous meeting

.5.1.1 Route 42 extension

- A successful route test took place on the 6th June 2005 for extension to Sainsburys via East Dulwich Grove and this is now the favoured option.
- London Buses and Sainsburys are now sorting out sanding arrangements at the store and this will be reported on at the next Southwark / London Buses liaison meeting in July.
- If Sainsburys reject the proposal then the Herne Hill option will be revisited.

5.1.2. Route 37 re-routing via East Dulwich Grove

- Consultation will start the week beginning the 11th July 2005 and will take 4 weeks.

5.1.3. Route 185 - Lordship Lane Northbound Bus Lane

- Designs were issued beginning of June for implementation.
- Expected start date for works is July 2005.

5.1.4. Route 12

- The item will be heard at full council at the end of July 2005.

5.1.5. Herne Hill Parking Bays

- Consultation has closed and members have agreed implementation. Designs have been finalised and works will be completed by Sept.

Questions:

Ken Hoole: re item 4 of minutes of last meeting – “Chris Bull’s reply to East Dulwich Hospital was available at meeting” – this was only received five minutes before meeting. Discussion of this reply was not allowed at that meeting -will it be discussed at this meeting?

Gill Portwine: Is Dulwich Hospital an item to be discussed today?

Cllr Eckersley: Planning brief will be discussed; not specific hospital issues which are matters to be raised with PCT. If there are specific irregularities and these are raised then Cllr Eckersley can write to Chris Bull. PCT can be touched on peripherally if health matters relate to planning brief.

6. Deputations and Petitions

There were none.

7. Emerging Southwark Plan

Simon Bevan, Principal Planning Policy Manager, spoke to this item:

Unitary Development Plan public inquiry

The public inquiry into the Southwark Unitary Development Plan opened on 12 April 2005 and is due to close on 15 July. The bulk of the public sessions in the town hall ended on 17 June although two further sessions have been arranged for 1 and 4 July.

A round table session was held on 20 May to consider the policies on housing density. This included discussion on the boundaries of the 'suburban zone' that the Mayor of London had objected to.

The papers submitted to the inquiry on density generally and in response to the Mayor's objections are publicly available.

The inspector at the public inquiry now has to consider all of the evidence he heard and documents submitted over 8 weeks. He also has written submissions on over 3000 objections to consider. He is expected to produce a report recommending how these should be resolved in around 6 months.

Issue of housing density zones:

The Southwark Plan has to be in general conformity with Mayor of London's strategic London Plan along with urban / suburban categories and guidelines based on character of area.

First draft of plan, 2002 – boundary of suburban zone was just north of Dulwich Village. Revised draft has new boundaries – suburban zone will take in East Dulwich and parts of Herne Hill. Mayor of London objected to this change. This is a key issue to be resolved.

Council has produced evidence (Density Topic Paper) which deals with density zones and detailed analysis of existing densities and character of area. LBS has a strong argument to support its proposed density zone boundaries.

Additional comments:

- Density guidelines are highly prescriptive e.g. how many rooms could be fitted onto a site.
- Developers assume they can build at highest level but other aspects of the Plan could rule this out.
- Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTALS) and other restrictions on site development should apply.
- Other factors determine density range on sites.

8. Section 106 Planning Contributions Strategy

An item is to be considered by the Executive on 12 July seeking approval for Consultation Draft Supplementary Planning Document: Section 106 Planning Contributions strategy.

Planning contributions under section 106 (of Town and Country Planning Act 1980) are secured by legal agreements between the council as local planning authority and developers seeking planning permission. Their purpose is to mitigate the impacts of development. The range of impacts that may be considered is very wide. For example, when a developer is building a large number of new houses or flats, the council might expect a contribution towards the provision of health, education, community and other services to compensate for the increased demand for those services from the people who will be moving in. Another impact that might be considered is greater demand

for public parks, especially when developments do not contain generous amenity space within their boundaries.

At present: decisions and negotiations with developers are made on case by case assessment to mitigate effects of development.

One of the measures proposed in the strategy is to compile lists of projects (Community Project Bank) that might be carried out in an area should development proposals come forward. It is proposed that community councils would be involved in compiling such community project banks in anticipation of future demands, which would be referred to when proposals come forward.

The draft document is to be the subject of consultation through the summer including presentations to community councils in September. It will be referred back to the Executive for approval in November.

Simon Bevan can be contacted on 020 7525 5411
Simon.Bevan@Southwark.gov.uk

Questions followed:

Mark Treasure: New developments are intensive with no internal space and high number of rooms per hectare (upto 1400 per hectare on some sites) and up to four floors high.

With S106 agreements, developers pay for loss of open space but they are using up all pockets of space which children can play on. Council recognises value of open spaces but spaces around houses are specifically excluded.

Cllr Bradbury: this Community Council demonstrated its commitment on density levels when it rejected proposal to develop Sir Ernest Shackleton pub, which was a high-density proposal.

Simon Bevan: that application came across as acceptable for suburban density zone. Advice of government and Mayor of London's requirement is to maximise use of land. LBS will look for suitable development on each site but use of land will be maximised – developments could be more intense. Development Plan is emerging and will be ready next year but will be question of implementation.

Cllr Humphreys: on the question of implementation, officers are not giving steer to developers for what is acceptable in suburban zone. Why are developers being encouraged to put forward applications substantially over Council's own emerging Plan. Sir Ernest Shackleton pub development proposal was 450 habitable rooms per hectare and this is in the suburban zone.

Simon Bevan: this is unusual. All parts of council should make sure Development Plan is being properly implemented.

Cllr Humphreys: officers should give general steer to developers what policy is.

Cllr Pearce: Victorian buildings had half basements and massing effect was less than today's developments. How much can Council steer design of properties?

Simon Bevan: Council cannot specify forms of development to that extent. LBS has policies that are supposed to be clear on what is acceptable but does not include a strict rule – architect can use skills creatively to maximise benefit of development.

Gill Portwine: Inspector can overrule Council's decision e.g. this happened with hostel development on Grove Vale and tried to use mitigating factors e.g. residents of hostel could not use cars. Can't restrict developers and S106 money goes into pot, not for local use. The hostel created extra demand on infrastructure and health provision, which should have been foreseen when Kings made decision on East Dulwich Hospital site.

Cllr Eckersley: there should be an improvement in future, with Community Council being able to monitor projects.

Ken Hoole: acknowledges hard work of team composing Southwark Plan but come under influence of London Plan and pressure from GLA and GOL. East Dulwich residents should be alerted to designation of area as urban but East Dulwich runs further south than Dulwich Village. Open spaces are under threat of change of definition.

Ken Hoole: definition of urban and suburban is misused, definition of suburban is of relatively large properties on large plots but East Dulwich is the opposite yet has been a suburb for 100 years.

Cllr Eckersley: Members' motion later. Advises residents to lobby Mayor of London and Val Shawcross within next two weeks to withdraw his objections. If objections are not withdrawn, it puts pressure on Inspector.

Cllr Humphreys: to date Val Shawcross and Tessa Jowell have supported suburban definition for East Dulwich.

9. Dulwich Hospital Planning brief

Simon Bevan had provided a briefing note on the planning brief.

- Potential for development to take place on site
- Guide that development by producing a planning brief
- Invited consultation
- Hospital services will be located at Kings College Hospital
- Reflects Southwark's priorities to make Southwark a healthier borough
- Would not use all of the site
- Other uses can be proposed for site e.g. housing
- Will contain specific statements on retaining the buildings

- Guide only on further development to access to site (vehicle and pedestrian)
- Reinforce requirements for housing; proportion of affordable housing should be provided and larger family housing
- Planning brief gives future developers an early steer on S106.

Questions followed:

Cllr Bradbury: Statutory consultation requires that certain bodies are consulted with but these are not listed in the document e.g. English Heritage and Victorian Society are not listed. Were these bodies consulted?

John Payne: What is future of Bowley Close? If facility closes it will impact on Crystal Palace area in particular.

Cllr Eckersley: This question will be put to Chris Bull.

Ken Hoole: The final brief has not been made available to East Dulwich Society.

Cllr Bradbury: The supplementary agenda containing the brief was only despatched to members of Planning Committee on 28 June 2005.

Ken Hoole: who briefed the officer who wrote the brief? PCT should make their research available so statements can be tested. Developers must not drive the development forward. PCT and developers are one and their interests are paramount.

Cllr Pearce: we must concentrate on planning brief concerns, UDP and S106 possibilities. The mix of development and densities is from the emerging Plan but local knowledge is missing e.g. already there is shortage of primary school places already. More family housing is proposed for site and will increase pressure on primary school places.

S106 may perhaps be available, but does not deliver land that is required (e.g. for school buildings). The site could provide Part 3 residential accommodation for older people.

Simon Bevan: this is possible and is not contrary to planning brief and could be added to planning brief.

Martin Wespestad: disappointed on shortage of facts and figures. Current building is unsuitable for health services. The original intention was this was a community hospital – it is incorrect that the building would not be suitable for housing use. Proposed medical facilities are non-specific, general practice, ancillary services. Why is building not listed? EDGE is adjacent to hospital and residents are very concerned.

This part of Dulwich could have influx of population and health needs will expand as population increases.

Cllr Bradbury: consultation part of brief states Dulwich Community Council and Norwood Area Committee (Lambeth) were consulted but not Camberwell Community Council – is this the case?

Ken Hoole: East Dulwich Society was not consulted.

Gill Portwine: very clear that local community does not want any part of this land to move out of public ownership. If Kings College Hospital say site is not needed, there is no point of reference to investigate their details/ figures. The site has been taken out of public sector and into hands of private speculators.

Cllr Eckersley: Prime purpose of site is health provision. If Health Authority requires more facilities in future, nothing in brief prevents that.

Robert Johnson: Planning brief refers to quality of existing building and Council should pursue in favour of refurbishment rather than rebuild.

Tina Thorpe: existing Arthritis Care at Dulwich Hospital is unsuitable e.g. long corridors, lifts inaccessible for people with mobility difficulties. In future, health care will be delivered in number of ways – electronically and in people's homes. Health care will become more local in future.

Cllr Welfare: question on housing density – the draft brief on this site sets density at upper end – due to proximity to public transport but does not take other factors into account such as level of density and pressure on schools.

Should emphasise community facilities on site and the section should be expanded eg hydrotherapy facilities could be added - other pools are under pressure

Simon Bevan: Upto Planning Committee to accept that.

Q: Can Mayor of London increase density for site – will this affect future build?

Cllr Eckersley: The PCT asset that some buildings cannot be retained feasibly for health use. If rest of site developed as residential could be possible to retain some architectural features of value.

Martin Wespestad: what is feasibility of hospital being converted – no feasibility studies done by PCT / Hospital Trust etc.

Scale of facilities proposed – some of site already cleared – proposed building can fit onto that part of site. Why knock down existing buildings? Not necessary to demolish present structures to provide health facilities. Can Dulwich Community Council ask that estimate for projected population is put into planning brief?

John Payne: Dulwich Society is not necessarily representative of all sections of Dulwich area.

Ken Hoole: community facilities should be provided but not on that site – it will cost £300 per sq meter and it's too expensive. It will be cheaper to modernise the current buildings rather than new build.

Gill Portwine: are there references to solar power and use of sustainable energy?

Simon Bevan: future uses should be energy efficient, uses of sustainable energy, recycling of waste etc are included in brief.

Tina Thorpe: if there are going to be high-density developments, then developer must contribute to development of schools.

Cllr Eckersley: Contact Natasha Flamer 7525 7055 for brief, can lobby Planning Committee on 5 July 2005.

A break took place between 8.30 – 8.45pm

10. Transport matters

Kendal Mackay: provided responses on questions from last meeting:

Dulwich Community Council had requested to be involved earlier in **BSP bid** process. However, guidance was only issued mid-late March and there was little time to go to Community Council. Transport department is now seeking consultation on potential schemes to feed into future programmes.

Spending over last few years:

2004/05 £1.4m spent in Dulwich Community Council area through BSP

2005/06 under £1m will be spent - includes CGS and Dulwich Community Fund grants

2006/07 bids amount to just under £600K – excludes borough wide projects.

Questions followed:

Cllr Pearce: re the 20 mph zone for North Dulwich Triangle - representations have been received from residential roads in Herne Hill and there is no traffic calming at Sunray Avenue roundabout.

Need to think of new measures to put in between Casino Avenue and Herne Hill where there is very heavy traffic.

Cllr Humphreys: re Borough road maintenance programme – this includes Alleyn Road on list for 2004/05. This has not been done - what is status on that road?

Kendal Mackay: it was part of 2004/05 programme (£2.4m) but funding couldn't cover it and it is still on list!

Ken Pearson: When cushions for 20mph zones are proposed they should use new cushions, as current cushions are ineffective.

Q: What is going to happen in Underhill Road?

Kendal Mackay:

- Southwark Council bids for money through BSP to TfL.
- Re Underhill Road – TfL do not fund traffic reviews but fund 20-mph zones – can bid to do that to address issues.
- Executive will agree bid in July.
- Goes to TfL on 22 July 2005 and LBS will be notified in November 2005, of the money for 2006/07.

11. Transport strategy

Kendal Mackay made presentation – see Appendix 1

Questions followed:

Cllr Humphreys: cycling safety in both Alleyn Park and Fountain Drive – dangerous cycle routes in both roads – officers to carry out or advise on safety audit of these two routes.

Smashed plastic bollards in Alleyn Park are also a danger for motorists and new guidelines / materials should be specified to prevent this in future

Kendal MacKay: new guidelines will be developed.

Martin Wespestad: further CPZs are subsidising central congestion zone.

Kendal Mackay: CPZs do not have to be one size fits all. Number of alternatives / charging methods can be introduced. Congestion Zone will remain and is supported by Southwark.

Tina Thorpe: pedestrians are top of hierarchy but footpaths are used by cyclists and not safe for pedestrians. No posters / no enforcement. Buses – need to move paper bins off kerbs so people can get on and off buses at stopping bays. Buses turn corners too fast.

Q: Are environmentally friendly buses being tested?

Kendal Mackay: Yes TfL are responsible for this and LBS will encourage their introduction.

Ken Pearson – if we don't make it safe for cyclists to cycle on road will cycle on pavements. Motorcycles park on pavements. Security of pedestrians must be enforced. When is draft cycling plan coming to CCs?

Kendal Mackay: Enforcement issues are highlighted along with secure facilities for motorcyclists at suitable locations.

Barry Mason: Supports hierarchy for cyclists and pedestrians but must have balanced approach – sometimes it is sensible to cycle on pavements and not road.

Cllr Pearce:

- Need pigeon netting on bridges / graffiti removal too
- Should encourage new buses and support the Dulwich bus
- Public transport is worst problem for Dulwich – public transport must be priority for Dulwich
- Need real commitment for car clubs
- Half Moon Lane has low noise emission surface and it's very good – should be extended to all roads
- People in electric wheelchairs should receive better services.
- Correct dreadful dropped kerbs, which don't work in Lordship Lane.
- There is consultation for extending congestion charging zone upto 15 July - some of that money will come through to improve south London transport
- Mayor's website – shows two corridors north/South to Vauxhall and East / West along embankment
- It will be impossible for Dulwich residents to get to airport
- People should go to website and make individual responses to impact on South London.
- Suggested collective response from members at 29 July 2005 meeting

12. Designation of certain Dulwich roads as 'Strategic Roads'

Information paper available at meeting. In March 2005, the Secretary of State designated Lordship Lane and boundary roads with Lambeth from Denmark Hill to South Croxted Road as "strategic roads." Will mean TfL have greater powers. Southwark will have to inform TFL who could object to proposals from Southwark eg on short term parking bays

13. Cleaner, Greener, Safer programmes - Tony Stefano

The update was available at the meeting.

Members requested the following information:

- Confirmation of planning applications for Dulwich Youth 2000
- Notice boards – important to implement members decision
- Lordship Lane shopping parade – confirmation of S106 money to supplement £15K
- Update on Darrell Road Community Centre (2003/04 scheme)

Robert Johnson – the shades for Dulwich Park are over budget (see Members decisions)

Gill Portwine: can we use CGS money to raise awareness of grot spots that are privately owned or is it prohibited?

Cllr Eckersley: not debarred in general terms for 2005/06.

Cllr Pearce: if it is private property contact Environmental Health Officers.

Mr. Palmer: North Dulwich Tennis Club – produced a tender and approach but slow in getting started – how long before it starts?

Cllr Humphreys: August 05 is assumed deadline for end date for project.

Cllr Welfare:

- reported on a recent meeting she had attended with Cllr Smith and traders.
- There is a delay in implementing scheme due to original open brief
- Original idea to improve paving and shop fronts – it is very expensive
- Advice from officers – paving should be priority - probably can only afford to do portion of paving
- Progress is being made.

14. Dulwich Community Fund – Donald Forde

The report was available at the meeting.

Comments and Questions followed:

Cllr Pearce: what is happening with “son of community fund”?

Donald Forde: it is under consideration by Executive. Expected to be launched in autumn 2005. To be reported to next appropriate meeting.

Q: Can Dulwich Festival bid for grant for next year?

A: Should bid in autumn.

Gill Portwine: Feasibility study for Home Zone was rejected for funding.

John Payne: There is an eyesore at bottom of Woodland Road – could this be eligible?

Cllr Humphreys: small measure could be considered to resolve this.

15. Soap Box Session/Public Question Time

Ben Kennedy: there is a planning application for another Vodafone mast on Barry House, 261 Barry Road. This is very close to St Anthony’s school. There are seven masts at the end of Etherow Street. Very concerned about technology. Would like advice on what to do next.

Cllr Eckersley: Mr. Kennedy should check with Alison Brittain (planning department) if planning application has been made. If it has, Dulwich Community Council members cannot discuss it now. If three objections are made to the application then it will be referred to Dulwich Community Council for decision.

Martin Wespestad: The application by Alleyn School to build on the site was refused and is now going to appeal. If appeal is successful would put pressure on local area.

Cllr Eckersley: Members support Metropolitan Open Land restrictions.

Mark Treasure: Strategic planning meeting organised by Kate Start on emotional well being of children on 12 July at Allbright Community Centre from 5 – 11 – food supplied.

Martin Wespestad: In Hospital planning brief the objection from EDGE is missing.

Cllr Eckersley: this is included in item to Planning Committee. If there are further concerns write to Chair of Planning Committee, copy in Cllr Bradbury.

16. Members' Decisions

Item 8 – Emerging Southwark Plan

Dulwich Community Council notes with approval this Council's written response to the Greater London Authority's objection in respect of density zone boundaries and urges all concerned not to depart from the Council's proposals in this respect as set out in the second Deposit Draft UDP.

In particular the Community Council notes that Urban Zone development (described in that Draft as "typically four to six storeys") would be completely inappropriate for the Dulwich area.

Item 9 – East Dulwich Hospital planning brief

Dulwich Community Council notes that the draft brief goes to Planning Committee on 5 July for final approval. Dulwich Community Council requests that Committee:

- a) include in the list of purposes for which a Section 106 Planning obligation may be sought:

"any other relevant public realm improvement;" and
- b) consider whether the specific reference to "green roofs" in paragraph 7.8.4 is consistent with the sustainability and renewable energy provisions of the latest version of the draft UDP
- c) Under 7.4.8 "...mix of dwelling type Add Part 3 residential accommodation will be an appropriate use of this site ... "
- d) Under 7.3.2 Add hydro-therapy facilities
- e) 7.4.2 Delete last sentence in its entirety

Dulwich Community Council notes with approval the efforts of local amenity societies and others to draw attention to the desirability of retaining more of the distinctive architectural features of the existing buildings, especially on the East Dulwich Grove frontage.

Item 12 - C,G,S 2004/05

The Officers' update report is noted. Projected under-and over-spends are noted, and resources are released to meet all currently projected overspends. In respect of the Dawson's Hill path the release of the required resources is subject to the contractor providing bollards to prevent unauthorised use by vehicles at no extra cost to the Community Council.

Members request a report on how ongoing costs (including maintenance) of schemes approved under C,G,S programme will be met.

Item 13 - Dulwich Community Fund

The officers' update report is noted. Community Council thanks the three respondents to the Dulwich in Bloom initiative and awards £750 to each of for purposes of brightening their estates.

Further decisions on under- and over-spends will be made at the 27 July meeting of Dulwich Community Council.

Item 15 – Local Parking schemes

1. Agreement in principle is given to the implementation, subject to consultation, of the local parking schemes set out in the agenda papers.
2. In respect of future applications for (a) individual parking spaces for the disabled and (b) deletions of such spaces when no longer required. Members wish to delegate decision-making to officers, unless objections are received. Members request officers to work up a scheme of delegation for consideration at the Community Council meeting on 27 July.

Closing Comments by the Chair

The Chair thanked everyone for coming to the meeting and announced the next general meeting is on Wednesday 27th July 2005 at Christ Church, Barry Road, SE22.

Date	Venue
Wednesday 27 th July 2005 – 7pm	Christ Church, 263 Barry Road, SE22
Wednesday 21 st September 2005 – 7pm	Christ Church, 263 Barry Road, SE22

Southwark Transport Strategy 2005-2010 - Local Implementation Plan

Why are we producing a transport strategy?

Southwark's transport strategy will also be known as the *Local Implementation Plan* (LIP)

The LIP is required under the GLA Act 1999

It will set out how an integrated package of transport improvements from 2005 through to 2010.

It will identify Council's own priorities

It will show how and when we will deliver the Mayor's *Transport Strategy*.

What does the transport strategy include?

Core Document

Road Safety Plan

Walking Plan

Cycling Plan

Parking and Enforcement Plan

School Travel Plan Strategy

Strategic Environmental Assessment

Equalities Impact Assessment

What are our transport objectives?

1. Improve accessibility throughout the borough
2. Promote sustainable travel and improve travel choice
3. Improve safety and personal security
4. Promote greater integration of land use development and transport
5. Improve quality, efficiency and reliability of transport
6. Improve efficiency, reliability and safety of freight distribution
7. Promote and improve social inclusion, economic development, education and housing
8. Improve visual amenity and the quality of the environment
9. Reduce energy use
10. Work with partners to progress and promote transport improvements

What are our transport priorities?

Road Safety

Sustainable Travel

Accessibility to public transport

Personal Safety & Security

Integrating of transport and land use

What does our strategy say and what are we going to do?

Road user Hierarchy

Pedestrians
Cyclists
Public transport and community transport
Powered Two Wheelers (PTWs)
Taxis
Freight Vehicles
Private Cars

Major transport and regeneration projects

Cross River Tram
East London Line Extensions
Thameslink 2000
Walworth Project
Elephant & Castle
London Bridge
Canada Water
Bermondsey Spa
Peckham and Camberwell

Walking

Pedestrian audits
Promote walking (Walk to School Week, Walking Wednesdays, etc)
Walking improvements (strategic routes such as Thames Path / Green Chain and local routes)
Improve access to transport & services (transport nodes and key centres of services, employment and attractions)
Improve safety and security (where this is a barrier to walking)
Monitoring and review programme

Cycling

Complete the London Cycle Network (LCN+) by 2009
Improve the local network (review signalised junctions, install advanced stop lines (ASLs), convert 1-way streets to 2-way)
Provide more cycle parking
Improve safety
Review enforcement practices
Promoting cycling
Undertaking training in schools and for adults.

Public Transport

Implement bus priority improvements and make all bus stops accessible by 2009
Review bus services in major and district town centres
Investigate potential for new or extensions to existing bus routes
Establish a programme of station access improvements and lobby the DfT and TfL to make all stations fully accessible
Lobby to increased capacity and extend tube and rail networks

Investigate potential for greater utilisation of ferry services
Work in partnership to improve levels of service

PTWs and motor vehicles

Promote the BikeSafe training programme
Review new ways to reduce PTWs casualties
Review design of speed reductions measures
Review theft hotspots implement secure parking facilities
Support congestion charging
Implement a range of different CPZs, charging and enforcement in accordance with the Parking and Enforcement Plan
Preparing a programme of road maintenance on borough roads

Road Safety

Lobby for funding for area wide traffic management studies
Reduce speeds (20mph zones) and undertake local safety schemes
Utilise new powers to enforce moving traffic offences and work with the police to improve enforcement
Establish programmes of road safety promotional activities and education and training for all modes of transport
Lobby for funding to implement home zones
Implementing safer routes-to-school initiatives

Maintaining the network

Continue programmes of principal and borough road maintenance
Continue programme of bridge assessment and strengthening
Continue to improve our underpasses and rail arches
Prepare guidelines for the design and maintenance of our streets
Prepare an asset management register of all street infrastructure
Continue programme of winter maintenance
Work with TfL to minimise disruption on our streets resulting from highway works

Accessibility

Provide safe and easy access to recreational facilities
Continue programme to improve pedestrian crossing facilities and linking places of interest
Review accessible parking throughout the borough
Review accessible transport services and consider accessible transport brokerage options
Support Taxicard and work with partners to the service
Investigate opportunities to fund an accessibility planning pilot

Air, Noise and Freight

Continue air quality monitoring programme
Develop the Biodiesel Fuel in partnership with other boroughs
Support the London Low Emission Zone (LEZ) by 2007
Use low noise emitting surfaces in all road renewal schemes
Manage freight through Freight Quality Partnership

Land Use

Develop a transport Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to guide future development

Preparation of a Green Travel Plan for the council

Require green travel plans for all new developments as well as for existing land uses

Establish Local Travel Planning Groups to assist the delivery of green travel plans

Promote car free development, car clubs and car sharing

What happens next?

Full strategy mid July for public consultation throughout the summer

Questionnaires and feedback forms will accompany the public consultation.

Final plan will be influenced by your contributions

When approved by Executive, it will be submitted to the Mayor of London for his approval – sometime in the autumn.

In the meantime, for more information you can contact:

The Transport Group

Southwark Council

Chiltern House, Portland Street, SE17 2ES

Telephone: 020 7525 5317

Email: transport@southwark.gov.uk