

**Nunhead and Peckham Rye Community Council
Traffic and Transport Sub-Group Meeting
Thursday 2nd September 2010, Town Hall 35, Peckham Road SE5 8UB
Draft Notes**

1. Welcome, introductions and apologies.

Cllr Gavin Edwards the new Chair of the subgroup welcomed everybody.

Present:

Cllr Gavin Edwards, Cllr. B. Hargrove, Val Shawcross Assembly Member, Alistair Hanton, Jeremy Leach & Judith Harris - Living Streets, John Gorsuch - Nunhead Residents Association, Bill Wood - Friern Rd., John Green - Lower Friern Neighbours, Eileen Conn - Peckham Vision & Bellenden Residents Group, Tom Chance & Kevin Christie.

Apologies:

None

In attendance:

LBC Officers

Michael Carnuccio (MC) Team leader Planning Policy

Marian Farrugia (MF) Neighbourhood Coordinator Peckham, Nunhead & Peckham Rye.

Hasan Mahmood, (HM) Contracts Manager – Parking

Simon Phillips (SP) Principal Transport Planner

David Sole (DS) Parking Services & Development Manager

Martin Talbot (MT) Team Leader, Environmental Enforcement

2. Minutes from the previous 17/02/10 meeting.

Agreed.

Matters arising.

- Camberwell Grove Railway Bridge: **ACTION:** SP will update at the next meeting.
- Parking: **ACTION:** MC will incorporate in AAP.
- Living Streets Report: JL stated that this report is a discussion document prepared to provide a vision of how sustainable transport in Peckham can be improved to encourage walking and cycling which can help inform the Area Action Plan. Discussion ensued regarding the way forward for the utilization of this document with residents suggesting that there should be ward discussions about it as well as presentations at Community Councils and involvement of Peckham Community Council. Residents felt however, that before it goes out, this document should be assessed by the relevant officers in order to look at the feasibility of the delivery of the suggested strategies and schemes especially with regards to funding.

Cllr. Hargrove stated that the only funding available for such schemes is the LIP bid – and the process has recently been relaxed. Living Streets schemes tend to be holistic, thereby requiring greater funding. Therefore the decision has to be around whether people would want holistic or more individual and local smaller schemes, decisions which need to be discussed at Community Council Meetings. SP outlined that some schemes are already planned e.g. The Peckham Hill Street and Bird in the Bush schemes. MC said that the AAP will also have a public realm strategy which will be linked to section 106 and other funding. JL also highlighted resources such as Sustrans' DIY streets which people can tap into.

- Sub-group notes should also include the names of residents.

Action:

1. Cllr. Edwards to distribute the document to ward councilors and chase for feedback including involvement of both local CC's.
2. Relevant Officers to provide feedback regarding feasibility and possible funding options.
3. Update from all of this to be reported at the next meeting.

The Chair thanked Living Street for voluntarily producing such a useful document for area.

3. Campaign to extend the 63 bus to Honor Oak Park Station.

Chair provided background on the campaign started by local people in order to extend this route explaining that TFL was arguing that extending the route would cost £470,000.

Val Shawcross said that from enquires that she had made, this seems to be the position. She explained that over the next 8 years there was going to be 1 –2 % reduction in bus miles in London. And since the London population is rapidly rising, there will be overcrowding and a reduction in bus services. TFL will say that any improvements have to be paid by taking out something else, but there is always scope for tweaking at the edges.

TFL have looked at the 63 bus, but because the P12 is already covering that route they argue that it would not justify the expenditure. The contract for the route was renewed a year ago and contracts get re-let every 5 yrs. TFL can tweak a bus route mid-contract but it needs demonstration of a clear demand. Considering the current climate, the picture is not optimistic, however if there is a case it needs to be made and be persistent.

One suggestion is that since all the passenger number studies are pre-east London extension, post-East London line data might demonstrate a need so the council might ask for more data regarding the East Line effect.

Cllr.Hargrove said that the council administration would be happy to support the campaign even if its for the long haul. He also stated that the council would also get the necessary surveys, whilst being mindful that the route and service is not disrupted because it runs through an area of transport deprivation.

Val Shawcross also explained that the route had been double decked as recognition of the use. Cllr.Hargrove had also spoken to the regional liaison officer for TFL who stated that with all the big worry they have is that of all the major transports investments such as cross rail etc. the buses might be the soft targets for the cutbacks which means that against that background, it will be hard.

Residents also suggested the possibility of running the bus for a few weeks as a trial run with Val Shawcross explaining that they can do that sometimes and sometimes councils and/or developers can subsidize trial runs.

Residents were also concerned that a new school with 950 kids was opening soon and the 63 was the only bus for it. The school will be at full capacity by 2014, the time when the next contract is due.

Val Shawcross suggested the gathering of more details on the school, more details of local petition responses and looking at passenger numbers at Honor Oak station

Residents also suggested the possibility of an extension during school times only. Val Shawcross replied that TFL sometimes change timetables to fit school times but probably never change a bus. Route because it is probably as expensive to run the bus for part of a day as for a whole day.

SP said that he has done work with the Girls' Academy who did have a "ghost bus" to arrive at a certain time to service the children. SP also said that the Harris Academy transport assessment does mention a link with the bus services

The Chair concluded that there is a chance for a strong case to be made for the extension of this route because the data might be old.

Action/Suggestion As a first step the sub-group will write a joint letter with Peter John, Barry Hargrove, Val Shawcross and Harriet Harman to TFL explaining the reasons for the need for an extension and go thru points discussed this evening.

Action: Simon to provide details regarding transport assessment. Information about station use to be obtained.

4. Improvements to Rye Lane (including enforcement measures on issues such as shopkeepers putting produce and waste on pavements, car parking and deliveries during rush hours. (Martin Talbot, (MT) Environmental Enforcement Officer)

MT said that rubbish in Rye lane is picked up morning and evening. Waste is picked up 5 to 6 times a day during the week and 3 times during the weekend. On Monday 4th October the team will re-establish time banding in Rye Lane; all waste will have to be contained within bags or bins. Collections will be 9.00 to 9.30 and 4.30 to 5.00 in afternoon 7 days a week.

Environmental Enforcement will be going through the waste bags to look at the dumping of waste. MT advised that this will lead to a build up of waste in the area over the short term.

Residents asked as to the logic of picking up rubbish at the rush commuting hours thereby causing congestions. MT answered that recycling vehicles had to be emptied by 6pm so there is a restriction as to how late the rubbish can be picked up.

Residents were also concerned at the amount of rubbish outside Peckham Rye station, arguing that the problem had to be cracked in order to make the station more attractive. Concern was also expressed that the banding which local residents had fought to obtain, had now collapsed. Cllr. Hargrove argued that the system collapsed because it was sold off to Veolia, which is not acceptable and a close eye has to be kept on it. MT added that the system collapsed due to lack of adequate policing of it. Veolia subbed it back to Southwark council and they are picking everything up. The people who were clearing it before are still doing it, the service is the same but they have changed the vehicle. And the problem with Rye lane is that you cannot always get documentation evidence in the bags. Cllr. Hargrove also said that there used to be a dedicated street warden team in Rye lane. Residents asked whether there was a way of assessing which businesses have contracts or not to which MT replied that there was, but it was difficult to identify who throws the rubbish out.

Residents also suggested that probably when it was sold to Veolia the original plan was not explained so it would be good to have an analysis of what happened so that the wheel is not reinvented. It would also be good to link this issue to the Urban Design Walk being organised in the area by the Peckham town centre forum on the 25th October.

Suggestion; The Chair therefore suggested that a briefing needs to be prepared outlining the problems, what resources are available, and options for the future because further to the initial deterrent it will go back to square one.

Action: Provide written briefing for the next meeting to better inform the debate re; rubbish collection on Rye Lane and present it to the sub-group.

Shop Front Extensions;

MT explained that 3 businesses on the lane had licenses for shop front extensions which have expired, so the team will be monitoring them.

Residents were also concerned about A Boards blocking pavements; however MT explained that it was difficult to prove obstruction because other clutter such as phone boxes has also to be taken into account. A boards taking less than 5% of the pavement width are legal. Residents also suggested that the area next to the bus station should also be monitored with regards A Boards, to which MT replied that that area is also covered.

Residents also wanted to know whether there was a way of making sure that licenses are not re granted and refused and whether there was any way in which the public could be involved in the granting of the license as to which shops should be renewed. MT replied that only 3 licenses are granted anyway. Cllr. Hargrove suggested that surely Southwark Council's policy to encourage walking and cycling could be used to influence the granting or not of such licenses. MT replied that it was Markets who dealt with licenses so it would be best to check with them. Residents therefore suggested looking at the possibility of linking these decisions to the Nunhead Community Council agenda which had intended to look at licensing on the Lane.

Other residents asked whether fines play a part to which MT replied that they do sometimes, however it often cost the council more money to take people to court than the fine so the council needed to take a balanced view of this.

5. Update on the traffic scheme being put in place to deal with the opening of the Harris Boys Academy. (Simon Phillips (SP) Principal Transport Planner).

SP explained that the Harris Federation commissioned a safety study covering both the Girls' and Boys' Academies. No significant changes to the network were proposed – calculations from the transport assessment submitted as part of the planning process predicted only a very minor increase in motor vehicle traffic around the new school. The Federation requested a new crossing on Peckham Rye outside the Boys School, but this could not be achieved due to the close proximity of an existing crossing at Friern Road which serves the LCN+ cycle route 25.

Residents queried whether the proposals included the lower part of Friern Road which the kids have to cross and which is used as a rat run in both directions. SP said that the council is carrying out a traffic count in October after the school opens to determine the extent of this problem. Residents pointed out that parking facilities within the school are limited and things will get worse as school attendance will escalate. Other residents stated that it is not the volume of traffic but the structure of the road that is causing the problems because it cannot accommodate traffic in both directions. The area where teachers park their cars blocks the street which is further blocked by trucks turning off Peckham Rye to Friern Road thinking that they can turn the corner and then having to back up. Furthermore, when the area is reasonably parked there is no space to pull in creating further space restrictions and blind corners. One suggestion was to make the road one way with no entry to alleviate traffic and make it safer. Consensus amongst residents was that the situation needed to be managed now because the situation will get worse, so vigilance is necessary. SP therefore suggested that it might be a good idea to organise a site meeting with the residents.

Action: SP to conduct site visit with the residents and look at the situation once the school is open and then provide sub-committee with findings and feedback.

6. Update on the Peckham Rye South Scheme. (Simon Phillips (SP) Principal Transport Planner).

SP updated the meeting, stating that a feasibility study looking at the both arms of Peckham Rye on either side of the common has just been completed. In particular, a traffic model has been developed to evaluate possible changes to the junctions with East Dulwich Road. There are a large number of collisions at the 'Kings on the Rye' junction which is also very congested. Possible changes are mainly tweaks to signal timings. It may be possible to implement a diagonal pedestrian crossing at the junction, but this would involve a trade off that might increase wait times at existing crossing points.

Many other schemes within the area had also recently been completed; e.g.:

- Contra flow cycling at northern end of Rye Lane
- Heaton road regeneration scheme
- Nigel Road safety scheme.

SP distributed a map of collisions highlighting that the eastern branch of this junction is a pedal cycle route going to Lewisham and that at peak times around 25% of vehicles on that route are bicycles.

SP highlighted that collisions are mainly due to congestion and poor road user behaviour. Maybe an enforcement and or education programme is necessary.

Residents said that part of the problem was that there was no filter going from East Dulwich turning right onto Peckham Rye and cars coming from Nunhead go through amber causing a cumulative effect. Other residents suggested more stop lines and changing of light phasing and other filters from East Dulwich to Peckham Rye to which SP responded that it might lead to further congestion and has to be passed by TfL, a process which has now become harder than before due to the Mayor's policy to 'smooth the traffic flow'.

SP also suggested that a diagonal crossing will improve pedestrian amenity, but not necessarily reduce accidents. SP ended saying that the scheme was a 2 yr. project; Provisional phasing is to start this year with a 'gateway' treatment where the road splits. This would involve changes to lane widths etc. made to slow cars down and to improve cycling conditions at the entrance to Peckham Rye (east). Proposals for this year should be confirmed by mid October.

Suggestions: The Chair suggested the possibility of looking at other examples in London to get ideas.

Action: To discuss the proposals for this junction at the next meeting.

PARKING ON RYE LANE: (David Sole (DS) Parking Services & Development Manager & Hasan Mahmood, (HM) Contracts Manager – Parking)

David Sole & Mahmood Hassan explained the parking restrictions on Rye Lane which are in force 24 hours (with allowances for loading on different sides of the street), saying that these

were monitored with CCTV and once a vehicle exceeds 2 minutes then a PCN (parking ticket) is issued by post. There are also officers walking along Rye Lane who can issue a ticket after 5 minutes of the contravention.

A Resident stated that Rye Lane is a complete nightmare and asked whether the balance is right around the parking in terms of loading times. The Chair agreed that buses are regularly caught in grid lock on the Lane and asked if there were any changes which could improve things. DS answered at the moment there were no plans to change things and that Rye Lane is certainly difficult to enforce, but that CCTV enforcement had worked because it had made Rye Lane clear enough to allow the buses to return in 2003.

The Chair also wanted to know if there were any plans to increase resources. DS answered that they have long hours of CCTV and monitor Rye Lane from 07.00 to 21.30 Monday to Saturday and 07.00 to 19.00 on a Sunday. In addition night mobile patrols pass through Rye Lane after these hours.

Another resident asked MC whether the AAP parking study had come up with any solutions, to which he replied that options are limited and that creative thinking is needed.

Another resident enquired whether the shop keepers belong to an association and/or are they represented somehow, and if there were ways to talk to them because they would want Rye lane to improve. DS replied that the council last consulted on the Peckham controlled parking zone including shop keepers in 2006 and typically consult every 5-10 years.

Action/Suggestion: The Chair suggested that it might be a good idea to discuss this issue another time after considering the Living Streets info which would help the sub-group come up with suggestions of its own.

4. A.O.B

Resident asked whether it would be possible for the participants to be emailed a list of Traffic and Transport proposals planned for the area in order that the group can be holistic about the area.

Action: MF to compile such list and email in advance.

Date of Next Meeting. TBC

Chaired by Cllr Gavin Edwards
Minutes taken by Marian Farrugia.