

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 12 October 2021	<b>Decision Taker:</b> Cabinet Member for Transport, Parks and Sport
<b>Report title:</b>		Rotherhithe & Surrey Docks Controlled Parking Zone Determination of Objections	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		Rotherhithe, Surrey Docks	
<b>From:</b>		Head of Highways	

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Transport, Parks and Sport:
  - i. Consider the 214 representations received via email as summarised in Tables 1 & 2 and the 168 representations received through our online traffic management orders system as summarised in Tables 3 & 4, received during statutory consultation relating to the proposal to introduce a new parking zone (permit parking bays and double yellow lines) in the Rotherhithe and Surrey Docks area. It should be noted that some representations provided more than one reason for objection, some addresses could not be determined and some email comments appear to have been sent by a consultee from more than one email address they hold.
  - ii. Consider and determine each objection and comment as per the table prepared by officers in Appendix 1 and note that the comments made online are available to the Cabinet Member for viewing in Appendix 4
  - iii. Instruct officers to write to each person who made representations to inform them of the council's decision.
  - iv. Instruct officers to proceed with installation of a parking zone in the Rotherhithe & Surrey Docks area operating from Monday to Friday between 8.30am and 6.30pm as per the Individual Decision Making report agreed on 20 Nov 2019.
  - v. Instruct officers to make the necessary Traffic Management Order.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. This report makes recommendations for the determination of a number of objections that relate to traffic orders published proposing new parking

restrictions across the Rotherhithe & Surrey Docks CPZ.

3. A total of 214 representations were received by email during the statutory consultation period (8 July 2021 – 29 July 2021), as detailed in the tables below. The grounds for representation included across this correspondence are summarised in Appendix 1 where roads within the consultation area could be determined. Of the 214 representations, 146 were classed as objections, 10 were classed as supportive of the proposals and 58 were comments, enquiries or correspondence regarding this proposed CPZ.
4. A Total of 168 representations were received through our online traffic management orders portal. Of the 168 responses received, nine were removed as the same person had submitted multiple responses and a further 11 were removed as that person had already submitted a response via email. 120 of the responses objected to all or part of the proposal and 22 supported all or part of the proposal. Six were classed as neutral. These responses are summarised in Tables 3 & 4.
5. One response was received via email following the close of consultation, this resident had previously responded and is against the controlled parking zone.
6. Part 3D, paragraph 23 of the Southwark Constitution sets out that determination of objections to traffic orders is reserved to the Cabinet Member for Transport, Parks and Sport.
7. The Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and the Climate Emergency approved, on 20 November 2019:
  - i. That the implementation of a new parking zone in the Rotherhithe & Surrey Docks, operating Monday to Friday, 8.30am to 6.30pm, be approved subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory procedures.
  - ii. That the position and type of parking bays and restrictions for the new parking zone and surrounding streets, as shown in the outline design (save for any amendments, which may be determined by officers as required at the implementation stage) be approved.
8. The decision to propose a new parking zone was made following public and ward member consultation. Full details of that study can be found within the background documents (Appendix 3).
9. In accordance with legislation<sup>1</sup> the council advertised its intention to make traffic orders in respect of the introduction of the new parking zone on 8 July 2021.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996

10. The consultation period ran for 21 days from 8 July 2021 – 29 July 2021.
11. Notice was given in the London Gazette<sup>2</sup>, local press (Southwark News) and street notices were placed in the affected area.
12. Notice was given to the following statutory consultees: London Ambulance Service, London Fire Brigade, Metropolitan Police Service, TfL Buses, Freight Transport Association, and the Road Haulage Association.
13. Notice was also given to non-statutory consultees including: Transport for London, Southwark Disablement Association, Southwark Disability Forum, Southwark Cyclists, Living Streets and London Travel Watch.
14. Full details of the proposal were also made available for inspection on the council's website or in person by appointment at 160 Tooley Street.

### **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

15. A total of 382 pieces of correspondence were received as a result of the statutory consultation.
16. Of the 146 objections that came into the council via email, only 106 could be established as a view from a resident within the consultation area. However, the other objections could be a view from residents, so they have been reported for completeness. 162 responses could be directly attributed to roads within the consultation area, detailing various topics and comments.
17. 168 responses came in through our traffic management order system. 20 were removed as duplicates and 120 were objections or part objections to the scheme.
18. Each piece of correspondence received during statutory consultation was responded to with an acknowledgement email/letter.
19. It should be noted that some responses contained more than one reason for objection.
20. It is noted by officers that a large amount of objections were received for this controlled parking zone, many stated that a controlled parking zone was not needed in the area. The aim of this project is to mitigate against future increases in parking stress due to upcoming developments and not against current parking stress. Officers still recommend the implementation of a controlled parking zone to ensure parking is prioritised for residents and businesses in the area. We will conduct a review of the zone six to twelve months following implementation to ensure that the restrictions are working well and make any minor changes

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.thegazette.co.uk/notice/2750202>

needed.

**Table One – Representations by street/property via email**

<b>Roads</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Roads</b>	<b>Count</b>
Rotherhithe street	35	Christopher close	1
Capstan Way	15	Farrins Rents	1
Rope Street	11	Fisher close	1
Fishermans Drive	10	Falkirk Court	1
Dean Close	8	Grove Street	1
Plover Way	5	Garter Way	1
Acorn walk	4	Greenland Quay	1
Russia Dock Road	4	Gunwhale close	1
Bonding yard walk	3	Howland Way	1
Elgar Street	3	Hurley Crescent	1
Middleton Drive	3	Lavender Road	1
Odessa Street	3	Lower road	1
Abbotshade Road	2	Marina	1
Bray Crescent	2	Needleman Street	1
Bywater Place	2	Onega Gate	1
Brunswick Quay	2	Plough Way	1
Capstan Road	2	Queen of Denmark Court	1
Globe Pond Road	2	Ropemaker road	1
Heron Place	2	Shipwright Road	1
<b>Roads</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Roads</b>	<b>Count</b>
Leydon Close	2	Smith Close	1
Pacific Wharf	2	Stanhope Close	1
South Sea Street	2	Steers Way	1
Timber Pond Road	2	Surrey Quays Road	1
Ann Moss Way	1	Surrey Water Road	1
Brewhouse walk	1	Sweden Gate	1
Brunel Road	1	Tawny Way	1
Bryan Road	1	Westlake	1
Canada Wharf	1	Wolfe Crescent	1
Cunard Walk	1	Wyatt close	1
Cookham Crescent	1	<b>Total</b>	<b>162</b>

**Table Two – Summary of Responses**

<b>Against</b>	146	68%
<b>For</b>	10	5%
<b>Comment</b>	58	27%
<b>Total</b>	<b>214</b>	

**Table Three – Summary of responses via online TMO system**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>I wholly support this proposal</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>I support this proposal, but would like the council to consider additional or alternative measures</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>I neither support or object, but would like the council to consider another related matter</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>I object to part of the proposal, but support or am neutral to other elements of it</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>I wholly object to this proposal</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>64%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>148</b>	

**Table Four**

<b>Street</b>	<b>Responses</b>
Finland Street	20
Rotherhithe Street	20
Fishermans Drive	15
Plover Way	9
Elgar Street	4
Howland Way	4
Maple Leaf Square	4
Outside of area	4
Rope Street	4
Brunel Road	3
Odessa Street	3
Outside area	3
Reverley Square	3
Brunswick Quay	2
Garter Way	2
Globe Pond Road	2
Greenacre Square	2
Keel Close	2
Quebec Way	2
Russell Place	2
Sweden Gate	2
Wolfe Crescent	2
Abbotshade Road	1
Acorn Walk	1
Ann Moss Way	1
Blondin Way	1
Burnside Close	1
Byfield Close	1

Bywater Place	1
Canada Estate	1
Capstan Way	1
Chargrove Close	1
Cookham Crescent	1
Dickens Estate	1
Dock Hill Ave	1
Elizabeth Square	1
Falkirk Court	1
Hawke Place	1
Highland Road	1
Hurley Close	1
Kinburn Street	1
Middleton Drive	1
Neptune House	1
Omega Gate	1
Oscar Court	1
Plough Way	1
Queen of Denmark Court	1
Radley Court	1
Ropemaker Road	1
Russia Dock Road	1
Sovereign Crescent	1
St Elmos Road	1
Stanton House	1
Staples Close	1
Surrey Quays Road	1
Windrose Close	1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>148</b>

21. The grounds for objection and the officer responses can be found in Appendix 1.
22. The response in support of the proposals included that there is an amount of inconsiderate and unsafe parking in the area, particularly near road junctions. Sometimes junctions in the area are difficult to navigate and residents often try to reserve spaces, more so in the 'estate' roads that residents have identified, detailed in Appendix 2. Background documents can be found at Appendix 3.
23. Any other comments that were raised during the statutory consultation are detailed in the respondent's correspondence.

### **Policy framework implications**

24. The recommendations contained within this report are consistent

with the missions of the Movement Plan 2019 (approved by Cabinet in April 2019 detailed in background documents) particularly:

- M2 Action 2 – Create simple and clear streets
- M3 Action 4 – Deliver infrastructure to support active travel
- M4 Action 7 – Reduce the number of cars owned in the borough
- M4 Action 8 – Use kerbside efficiently and promote less polluting vehicles
- M4 Action 9 – Manage traffic to reduce the demand on our streets
- M7 Action 15 – Reduced exposure to air pollution
- M7 Action 16 – Zero people killed or injured on our streets by 2041

## **Community, equalities (including socio-economic) and health impacts**

### **Community impact statement**

25. The missions within the Movement Plan have been upheld in this report.
26. The recommendations are area based and therefore will have greatest effect upon those people living, working or traveling in the vicinity of the areas where the proposals are made.
27. The implementation of a new parking zone will benefit the local community by removing commuter parking and parking displaced from other nearby parking zones resulting in an overall increase in the number of parking spaces available to residents. Residents who are entitled to a Blue Badge will be able to apply for a disabled parking bay outside their home.
28. There is a risk that the new parking zone may cause displacement to roads on the periphery of the proposed area which could trigger the need for further consultation and additional funding. It is more likely there will be parking issues from encroachment into the area though, due to the new development.
29. 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.

### **Equalities (including socio-economic) impact statement**

30. The proposals are not considered to have any adverse effect on socio-economic or health equalities. Safety for pedestrians and in particular vulnerable users such as the elderly and disabled persons will be greatly assisted with clearer locations where parking is permitted and also see where it is safer to cross the road.

### **Health impact statement**

31. The proposals support the council's mission to use the kerbside efficiently

and promote less polluting vehicles, manage traffic to reduce demand on our streets and reduce exposure to air pollution by reducing the availability of parking for those commuting into Southwark.

### **Climate change implications**

32. The report has considered how the proposed measures impact on climate change. The measures support the aims of the council's Climate Change Strategy under Priority 2 – Active and Sustainable Travel. Key aims of the council's Climate Change Strategy include to 'reduce car journeys to a minimum by 2030' and to 'be a borough where the walking and cycling becomes the default way to get around'. Part of meeting the borough's ambition of net zero emissions by 2030 includes a reduction in vehicle km's travelled and a shift to active and public transport; road transport currently accounts for 15% of the borough's emissions. These measures strongly support that ambition by prioritising parking for residents and freeing up kerb space for more sustainable travel options.
33. Data will be collected to inform the ongoing development of the scheme. We will consider the use of additional planting, sustainable urban drainage or rain gardens on the highway to ensure the scheme is further in line with the Climate Change Strategy's Priority 3 – Thriving Natural Environment which include actions to 'create greener streets'. We will mitigate against the potential negative impact of construction works on the climate by ensuring our contractor uses electric vehicles where possible and a carbon calculator for material specifications.
34. A just and inclusive transition is at the heart of the council's emerging climate policy. These proposals prioritise the movement of people first and foremost, while retaining vehicle access for those who require it. In delivering a safer and more equitable highway network, the measures are in accordance with the council's approach to addressing the climate emergency

### **Resource implications**

35. All resource implications will be contained within the existing Highways structure.

### **Legal implications**

36. Traffic Management Orders would be made under powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984.
37. Should the recommendations be approved the council will give notice of its intention to make a traffic order in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales Regulations 1996).

### **Financial implications**



38. Any additional costs in excess of the original budget agreed in November 2019 will be contained within existing divisional revenue budgets.

## **Consultation**

39. Statutory consultation has been carried out as detailed in paragraphs 7 to 12 of this report.
40. Informal consultation was also undertaken.

## **SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS**

### **Director of Law and Governance**

41. The Cabinet Member for Transport Parks and Sport is asked to confirm the next steps leading to a new parking zone for the Rotherhithe and Surrey Docks area. This has been the subject of a statutory consultation for which 382 representations were received of which 266 were classed as objections. The response to the objections is set out in the Tables in this report and also in Appendix 1.
42. The objections received following statutory consultation in respect of the proposed traffic management orders required to implement the traffic and highway improvements must be considered in accordance with administrative law, human rights law and statutory powers. The Human Rights Act 1998 imposes 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 highway and planning purposes are Article 8 (respect for homes); Article 6 (natural justice) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (peaceful enjoyment of property). The implementation of the proposals is not anticipated to engage or breach the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998.
43. 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. Paragraph 28 of the report informs that it is considered that the proposals will have no detrimental impacts on a particular protected group under the Equality Act. The duty must be exercised by the decision maker and the Member needs to form this conclusion
44. Should the Cabinet Member be satisfied with the contents of this report then they have the power to make the decisions recommended at

paragraph one by virtue of paragraph 3d of the Council Constitution.

### **Strategic Director of Finance and Governance (EL21/052)**

45. The report is requesting the Cabinet Member for Transport, Parks and Sport approve a number of recommendations detailed in paragraph 1 of this Objection Report pertaining to the proposal to introduce a new parking zone in the Rotherhithe & Surrey Docks area.
46. The strategic director of finance and governance notes that funding for these recommendations is to be met from Highways departmental budgets and that there are sufficient resources available to fund this implementation.
47. Staffing and any other costs connected with these recommendations to be contained within existing departmental revenue and capital budgets.

### **Other officers**

48. No other comments received.

### **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

<b>Background Papers</b>	<b>Held At</b>	<b>Contact</b>
Rotherhithe & Surrey Docks Consultation Report	Southwark Council Transport Projects Highways 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Joanna Redshaw
<a href="https://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=6973">https://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=6973</a>		
Movement Plan 2019	Southwark Council Environment and Leisure Highways 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Joanna Redshaw
<a href="http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=6809">http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=6809</a>		
Climate Change Strategy	Southwark Council Environment and Leisure Highways 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Chris Page

<https://www.southwark.gov.uk/environment/climate-emergency?chapter=3>

## APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Officer response to objections
Appendix 2	Responses redacted
Appendix 3	Background documents
Appendix 4	Representations via Mapper redacted

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Dale Foden – Head of Highways	
<b>Report Author</b>	Malcolm Harris – Parking Engineer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	02/09/21	
<b>Key Decision?</b>	Yes	
<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 Governance	Yes	Yes
Strategic Director of Finance and Governance	Yes	Yes
List other officers here		
<b>Cabinet Member</b>	Yes	Yes
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</b>	11 October 2021	