

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 8 February 2012	<b>Decision Maker:</b> Cabinet Member for Transport, Environment and Recycling
<b>Report title:</b>		Southampton Way Controlled Parking Zone. Determination of statutory objections	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		Brunswick Park / Camberwell Green / Faraday	
<b>From:</b>		Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure	

### **RECOMMENDATION**

1. Consider the 106 objections received during statutory consultation of the Southampton Way (SW) Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), detailed in Appendix A of this report and summarised in table 3.

#### **Option 1**

2. Reject all 106 objections, summarised in Table 3, for the reasons given in paragraphs 30 to 64.
3. Implement a modified Southampton Way CPZ across the full area with reduced hours 10am to 2pm, Monday to Friday.

#### **Option 2**

4. Accede to 83 objections, summarised in Table 2, received from those streets to the east of Wells Way.
5. Reject 10 objections, summarised in Table 2, received from those streets to the west of and including Wells Way for the reasons given in paragraphs 30 to 64.
6. Implement an experimental extension of East Camberwell (EC) CPZ to include the northern section of Southampton Way (Wells Way to New Church Street), Parkhouse Street, Cottage Green and Wells Way (Parkhouse Street to St George's Way).
7. Modify the bay outside 191-199 Southampton Way as previously proposed.

#### **And**

8. Instruct officers to write to those objectors to inform them of the council's decision.
9. Instruct officers to make the necessary Traffic Management Order.
10. Make the first parking permit available at the consulted rate.

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

11. This report makes recommendations for the determination of a number of objections that relate to traffic orders that are of a strategic nature as they relate to the introduction of a new controlled parking zone.
12. The objections were received as a result of statutory consultation procedure concerning the introduction and making of a CPZ in the Southampton Way area.

13. Part 3D paragraph 24 of the Southwark Constitution sets out that determination of objections of a strategic nature are reserved to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Recycling.
14. The Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Recycling approved<sup>1</sup>, on 23 September 2011, the introduction of a CPZ in the Southampton Way area subject to the outcome of statutory consultation.
15. The decision to introduce the Southampton Way CPZ was made following public and community council consultation on the principal and the detail of the CPZ. Full detail of that study can be found within the background documents.
16. In accordance with legislation<sup>2</sup> the council advertised its intention to make traffic orders in respect of the Southampton Way CPZ on 20 October 2011.
17. The consultation period ran until 10 November 2011.
18. Notice was given in the London Gazette<sup>3</sup>, local press (Southwark News) and street notices were placed in the affected area.
19. 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.
20. Notice was also given to non-statutory consultees including: Transport for London, Southwark Disablement Association, Southwark Disability Forum, Southwark Cyclists, Living Streets and London TravelWatch.
21. 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.
22. A letter was also sent to all properties within the CPZ area advising of the statutory consultation and the opportunity to comment or object. This additional notification was made at the request of Camberwell Community Council.

## KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

23. A total of 137 pieces of correspondence were received as a result of the statutory consultation. They are classified by type in Table 1 below.

<b>TABLE 1</b>	<b>Quantity</b>
<b>Type of correspondence</b>	
Objection	106
In support of proposals	18
General enquiry / comments	14

24. A copy of each of the 106 objections can be found in Appendix A.
25. The street name of each objection, where provided, is identified in Table 2.
26. The reasons for objection are summarised, by street, in Table 3.

<sup>1</sup> <http://moderngov.southwarksites.com/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=2401>

<sup>2</sup> [The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders \(Procedure\) \(England and Wales\) Regulations 1996](#)

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.london-gazette.co.uk/issues/59944/notices/1460757/>

<b>TABLE 2</b>		<b>Street</b>	<b>Objection</b>	<b>Support</b>
West		Parkhouse Street	1	
		Chiswell Street	1	
		Wells Way	6	7
		Southampton Way (west of Wells Way)	2	2
		<b>Total (west)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
East		Bonsor Street	5	
		Coleman Road	31	1
		Dowlas Street	5	2
		Rainbow Street	26	5
		Southampton Way (East of Wells Way)	9	
		Tilson Close	7	
	<b>Total (east)</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>8</b>	
	<b>No address</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1</b>	
	<b>Total (west + east)</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>18</b>	

27. Table 2 identifies that the vast majority (78%) of objections came from the group of streets to the east of Wells Way. 9% of objectors originated from people living on or to the west of Wells Way.

<b>TABLE 3 - Reason for objection</b>	<b>Section of consulted area</b>	<b>A No parking problem on my street</b>	<b>B Cost of permits</b>	<b>C Proposed hours of CPZ operation are unsatisfactory</b>	<b>D Proposal made for alternative hours of control</b>	<b>E Concern about CPZ consultation</b>	<b>F No reason given</b>	<b>G Money making scheme only</b>	<b>H Detailed design comments</b>
Bonsor Street	East	3	2	1	1		1		1
Chiswell Street	West								1
Coleman Road	East	21	10	9	4	3	2	5	6
Dowlas Street	East	3	1	1	1	1	1		2
Parkhouse Street	West		1						
Rainbow Street	East	15	10	2	2	5	3	2	8
Southampton Way	ALL	5	7				2	2	4
Tilson Close	East	3	2						6
Wells Way	West	1	2			1	2		2
No address supplied		6	6	1	1	3	3	1	2
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>57</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>32</b>

28. It should be noted that many objectors gave more than one reason for their objection. Table 3 identifies each matter raised therefore the total number of reasons given (190) will be greater than the number of individual objections (106).
29. Paragraphs 30 to 64 consider each of the eight classified reasons (Table 3) and provide an officer response to the matters raised.

#### **A - No parking problem on my street**

30. 30% of those objecting made a comment to the effect that they did not consider there to be a parking problem in their street.
31. Comments also classified under this heading noted that they are not near a train or tube station or that only one bus route goes through the proposed zone and that they believe there are no commuters parking in their streets.
32. Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTAL) do vary across the CPZ area between 4 (moderate or above) and 1b (poor).
33. However, officers note that the occupancy and duration parking beat survey carried out in November 2010 showed that, as a weekday average, 26% of the parked vehicles in this area were owned by commuters or non-residents. This would indicate that a significant proportion of commuter drivers do use the area for parking and then continue their trip to work by another transport mode (eg. bus, walk, cycle).

#### **B - Cost of permits**

34. 22% of those objecting made a comment to the effect that the cost of the resident's permit and visitors vouchers is too high.
35. Permit charges are set at a level to cover cost of administration and with the aim of achieving the objectives of parking controls: that is prevention of waiting where there is a risk to road safety or potential for congestion, and to manage parking space in areas where demand exceeds supply.
36. Parking permit charges are one part of the council's discretionary fees and charges and are set on a borough-wide level usually reviewed on an annual basis. They are not an element open to consultation as part of any CPZ project.
37. It is noted, however, that this report recommends that the permit charges for either CPZ option should be made available at the consulted (2009/10) level for the first permit purchased by each resident; that is £99.30 for a 12 month resident's permit. This differs from other existing CPZs within the borough where the annual permit has now risen to £125. This would remain the case even if the CPZ became operational after 1 April 2012 but no later than 1 April 2013.
38. There is no scope to vary the permit charges as part of this project. However comments relating to visitor permits and the possibility of introducing a new version (issued at a lower cost) for CPZs that only operate for part of the day have been noted and are currently being considered by Parking Operations.

#### **C – Hours of CPZ operation are unsatisfactory and**

#### **D – Objector makes proposal for alternative hours of control**

39. 7% of those objecting made a comment to the effect that the proposed hours were too long.
40. It was stated by a number of the objectors that CPZ hours were excessive and unnecessarily restricted residents and their visitors.

41. There was also a comment that parking difficulties were at the highest on Sundays due to the church on Wells Way.
42. No comments were made specifically about the days of operation but 5% of those objecting made a suggestion to vary (lessen) the proposed hours of control which would achieve the objective of preventing commuter parking but not unnecessarily burden residents.
43. Officers consider that a 4 hour CPZ would be operationally successful for this area – and this was an option considered during the earlier informal consultation.
44. Four hours control can provide flexibility for visitors and trades people while still achieving protection from commuter parking.
45. If the eastern part of the CPZ is to be progressed and in response to the comments made above, a 4 hour CPZ between 10am and 2pm, Monday to Friday should be considered for the entire area.
46. If only the western part of the CPZ is approved it is recommend that a 10 hour CPZ is implemented. This is recommended on the basis that there was clear support (in the original consultation) for all-day controls. In the interests of logical boundaries it is further recommended that a western part only should be an extension of EC CPZ.

#### **E - Concern about CPZ consultation**

47. 7% of those objecting made a comment to the effect that the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> stage consultations held in December 2010 and January 2011 had received a low response rate and that the results and subsequent decision were not representative of the area.
48. The informal consultation yielded a response rate of 15%. This is below the 20% threshold we use to give major weight to the consultation result. In this circumstance, the Parking and Enforcement Plan sets out that the views of the community council will be given extra weight.
49. Prior to the decision (to progress to statutory consultation) the results were reported to the public meeting of Camberwell Community Council for final representations
50. Officers initial recommendations in the report presented at that meeting were to install a CPZ to the west of (and including) Wells Way but the clear message expressed at the meeting by members was that, in the interests of dealing with a parking problem that would only become worse and so as to avoid a piecemeal CPZ implementation programme, the CPZ should be installed across the full area at this point and on a trial basis.
51. The feedback from that meeting assisted the decision making when the final report was presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Recycling in September 2011.
52. There are no significant concerns about the method or timing of the informal consultation nor the decision making process. The consultation followed the council's standard CPZ process for consultation and was carried out simultaneously and with identical material as the Lucas Gardens CPZ study which yielded a far more robust (24%) response rate.

#### **F - No reason given**

53. 7% gave no reason for their objections stating only that they strongly disagreed or objected to the proposed CPZ.
54. As no reason for these objections has been made it is recommended that they be rejected.

## **G - Money making exercise only**

55. 5% of those objecting made a comment to the effect that the proposed CPZ is just a revenue raising exercise by the Council and that they consider that as they pay council tax or road tax that they should not have to pay for a residents permit.
56. Legislation sets out that the council must operate a ring-fenced parking account. The parking account must also be self financing (ie. not supported by other funding sources such as council tax). The same legislation also limits where any surplus can be spent, in short it must be reinvested into roads and parking.
57. The council publishes its parking account on an annual basis and this sets out exactly what income and expenditure is made upon this account.
58. The cost of Southwark's resident parking permits remain at or below the central London average and contribute a relatively small proportion (approx 15%) of total parking income, the largest proportion of income comes from penalty charge notices (approx 65%).
59. The comments are noted but it is recommended that the objections should be rejected.

## **H - Detailed design comments**

60. 17% of those objecting made a comment to the effect that they had concerns with the detailed design
61. Many of those comments related to the "at any time" waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) proposed for Tilson Close. In view of these, it is recommended that those double yellow lines be dropped and that the cul-de-sac be defined as "permit holders only beyond (this point)".
62. This non-prescribed signage has been very successfully implemented in The Hamlet, SE5 and has the effect of designating the whole Close as a single parking place (without any road markings) but still requiring vehicles parking within it (on the public highway) to display a permit, therefore avoiding any displaced parking that would occur if this road had no restriction placed within it
63. On more general matters the following other points were made:
  - A. the council should lobby for Cycle Hire to be extended to the area
  - B. that parking surplus should be reinvested into road surfaces and potholes
  - C. that rat-running should be prevented by closing vehicle access through Newent Close
64. These more general matters are outside the scope of this project but are noted and have been referred to the relevant departments.

## **Policy implications**

65. The recommendations contained within this report are consistent with the policies of the PEP, the council's overall transport strategy and the emerging Transport Plan, particularly:

### **Policy 1.1 – pursue overall traffic reduction**

- Parking, by definition, occurs at the end of a vehicle trip. By managing or limiting the provision of parking to certain users or classes of vehicle, CPZs contribute to the reduction of traffic. This is predominantly achieved by preventing commuter or long-stay parking and associated traffic.

### **Policy 2.3 – promote and encourage sustainable travel choices in the borough**

- By managing the supply of parking, CPZs are significant in

releasing suppressed demand for sustainable modes, such as walking, cycling and public

Policy 4.2 – create places that people can enjoy

- Parking controls assist in reducing the dominance of on-street parking. They ensure that where it is permitted it is prioritised fairly and takes place in appropriate places.
- CPZs reflect the fact that only 50% of households in Southwark have access to a car and that balance should be made in the allocation of road space

Policy 8.1 – seek to reduce overall levels of private motor vehicle traffic on our streets

- CPZs contribute to the reduction in private motor vehicle traffic by preventing commuter parking. If parking spaces are not available at the destination then an alternative (more sustainable) method of transport is likely to be chosen to carry out that trip.

### **Community impact statement**

66. The implementation of a CPZ contributes to an improved environment through the elimination of on-street commuter parking and the associated reduction of local and borough-wide traffic levels. Comments on the impact of the revised CPZ were sought by the Council via the Camberwell and Walworth community councils and also through the statutory consultation process.
67. The policies within the Parking and Enforcement Plan are upheld within this report and have been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA).
68. The implementation of a CPZ may benefit disabled motorists by reducing parking demand in locations that currently allow unrestricted parking.
69. The implementation of a CPZ will provide greater protection of parking spaces to all residents and their visitors living within the zone. This prioritisation of space provides a benefit to all resident permit holders.
70. The overall implementation of a CPZ may be detrimental to those persons who currently drive to the area who will now be required to pay for parking during the operational hours of pay and display or be excluded if staying longer than the permitted maximum stay at a pay and display bay.

### **Resource implications**

71. There are no resource implications associated with the recommendations contained within this report that have not been previously agreed.
72. This report is to determine statutory objections made in relation to a proposed traffic order.
73. There are no additional costs as a result of these recommendations.

### **Consultation**

74. Informal and statutory consultation has been carried out as detailed in paragraphs 14 to 22 of this report.

## SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS

### Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance (SH0112)

75. The Cabinet Member for Environment Transport and Recycling is being asked to consider and determine the objections received in respect of the SOUTHAMPTON WAY CPZ area, and to proceed with a modified CPZ.
76. The objections have been received following the statutory consultation process in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 and the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984. Under Regulation 14 the Council has discretion to modify the Order following any objections received, and the recommendation to proceed with a modified CPZ following the making of objections would be in accordance with Regulation 14.
77. Part 3D paragraph 23 of the Southwark Constitution gives the Cabinet Member for Transport, Environment and Recycling the authority to determine objections to traffic orders which are of a strategic nature.
78. Once the objections have been determined by the Cabinet Member the Traffic Management Orders will be made by officers under delegated powers, as the making of a Traffic Management Order is not a matter specifically reserved to any other Council decision making body.

### Finance Director (NR1211)

69. This report recommends that the Cabinet Member for Transport, Environment and Recycling considers the 106 objections received during statutory consultation of the Southampton Way (SW) Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), rejects some or all of the objections for the reasons and proceeds with a modified CPZ. It further recommends that officers write to those objectors to inform them of the council's decision and make the first parking permit available at the consulted rate.
70. The Finance Director notes that there are no additional resource implications arising from the report recommendations. Officer time to effect the recommendations will be contained within existing budgeted revenue resources.

## BACKGROUND PAPERS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Lucas Gardens and Southampton Way 1st and 2nd stage controlled parking zone report	Southwark Council Environment & Leisure 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH  Online: <a href="http://moderngov.southwarksites.com/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=2401">http://moderngov.southwarksites.com/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=2401</a>	Tim Walker  (020 7525 2021)
Transport Plan 2011	Southwark Council Environment Public Realm Network Development 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Tim Walker  (020 7525 2021)

	Online: <a href="http://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/200107/transport_policy/1947/southwark_transport_plan_2011">http://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/200107/transport_policy/1947/southwark_transport_plan_2011</a>	
--	--	--

## APPENDICES

No.	Title
A	Objections received during statutory consultation between 20 October and 10 November 2011

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Gill Davies, Strategic Director Environment & Leisure		
<b>Report Author</b>	Des Waters, Head of Public Realm		
<b>Version</b>	Final		
<b>Dated</b>	8 February 2012		
<b>Key Decision?</b>	Yes	<b>If yes, date appeared on forward plan</b>	November 2011
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER</b>			
<b>Officer Title</b>	<b>Comments Sought</b>	<b>Comments included</b>	
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	Yes	Yes	
Finance Director	Yes	Yes	
<b>Cabinet Member</b>	Yes	Yes	
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</b>			8 February 2012