

PUBLIC QUESTION – CABINET 10 JULY 2023

Alex Hamilton

In his 2021 paper ‘Tackling the Climate Emergency Together’, Councillor Leader Williams promised as an ‘immediate action’ to ‘Review the 11 existing LTNs over the next 18 months including impact on carbon emissions.’ When will Southwark publish this data, rather than traffic counts and air quality monitoring data?

Response by Councillor James McAsh, Cabinet Member for Climate Emergency, Clean Air and Streets

All monitoring data including air quality monitoring can be found at the following weblink for all Streetspace schemes:

[Streetspace - Southwark Council](#)

With respect to air quality, please see a typical report for the “Dulwich Streetspace Air Quality Modelling (June 2021 traffic monitoring)” report that can be found at the following weblink:

[Dulwich streetspace - Southwark Council](#)

The report contains details on nitrogen and carbon emissions.

In summary, for the majority of building façade locations along scheme roads, the changes in pollution concentration are classed as Negligible. Non-negligible impacts at building façade locations are predicted for annual average NO2 concentrations in areas shown in the maps contained in the report. Areas where Beneficial impacts (air quality improves) or Adverse impacts (air quality worsens) are predicted include:

- Moderate Beneficial and Slight Beneficial impacts on Grove Vale, from Vale End to Elsie Road and Ondine Road to East Dulwich Road
- Slight Beneficial impact on Melbourne Grove, for an 80 m section of road from the junction with Grove Vale
- Slight Beneficial impact on Calton Avenue, from Court Lane to Woodward Road
- Slight Adverse impact on East Dulwich Grove, from Lordship Lane to Matham Grove.

PUBLIC QUESTION – CABINET 10 JULY 2023

Linda Bird

In Southwark's final 'equality impact assessment' covering Dulwich LTN, used as evidence to make the scheme permanent, four academic research papers by Anna Goodman are cited and relied on. Given the recent Telegraph article questioning her integrity and impartiality, will Southwark now revisit this assessment?

Response by Councillor James McAsh, Cabinet Member for Climate Emergency, Clean Air and Streets

The council will not be revisiting the equality impact assessment. The council does not believe the information contained in the research papers is biased, invalid or incorrect.

PUBLIC QUESTION – CABINET 10 JULY 2023

Richard Newell

Since borough-wide CPZ was not a manifesto policy and since the public consultation on the Movement Plan did not ask for the public's views on the idea of controlled parking, will the cabinet accept that the general public in Southwark has never agreed to the idea of a borough-wide CPZ?

Response by Councillor James McAsh, Cabinet Member for Climate Emergency, Clean Air and Streets

In the May 2022, election the manifesto upon which I stood was absolutely clear about its ambitions. It talks specifically about improving our air quality, creating safer, greener and healthier streets, improving our cycling and walking infrastructure and improving our public transport routes. Crucially, it also points towards measures to reduce the number of polluting cars, including the introduction of variable parking fees across the whole borough.

Furthermore, the Movement Plan 2019 was widely consulted on borough wide prior to implementation. The Plan set out the aspiration for borough wide controlled parking. This was reaffirmed and widely consulted on as part of the Climate Change Action Plan adopted in 2021 (refG.4.iii).

We are committed to delivering the Council's Streets for People programme and associated vision for Southwark to be a clean, green and safe borough. We will reclaim space for our communities to connect and socialise; for safe and healthy journeys; a thriving local economy, and our natural world. Fewer cars will lead to better air quality and a healthier environment.

A borough wide consultation was undertaken in December 2022 on the Sustainable Transport Strategy, the successor to the Movement Plan. The response to the consultation can be reviewed as Appendix 2 of our ambitious Streets for People Strategy being presented to cabinet on 10 July 2023. The headline responses from the consultation included:

- Over 70% of respondents want to see traffic reduction in Southwark.
- Fewer cars and streets that are designed for people first, are at the heart of the change people want to see.
- Making cycling safer, easier and more enjoyable is a significant priority for people in Southwark.
- People want to see ambitious and urgent action taken to address climate change - over 80% of people who responded to the consultation agree that to act on climate change we need to change our behaviours.

Given these responses, there are changes that need to happen in order to deliver the ambitions of the majority of Southwark residents. Controlled parking is just one of the elements.

PUBLIC QUESTION – CABINET 10 JULY 2023

Tristan Honeyborne

Can the cabinet member for streets direct me to where in the Dulwich Village Phase 2 consultation report his claim ‘the feedback... was supportive in relation to the objectives of the permanent scheme at the junction of Calton Avenue and Dulwich Village’ is evidenced; the report showed no such support?

Response by Councillor James McAsh, Cabinet Member for Climate Emergency, Clean Air and Streets

A consultation was carried out in November and December 2022 on the Dulwich Streets for People proposals which included the existing traffic restrictions at the Dulwich Village/Calton Avenue junction.

These changes to the junction have seen significant increases in walking and cycling which is a key objective of our ambitious Streets for People programme. The council’s Streets for People strategy is designed to encourage a model shift towards walking and cycling, and creating spaces which are supported by those who use these modes of transport is a key part of this work.

Whilst it is true that those respondents who walk and cycle were much more likely to support our objectives, the report also shows that those who are car-users are much less convinced by our objectives related to safety, community and connections. My previous answer to your question in June did not make this distinction clear and in future, I will be sure to be more precise.