

Item No. Members' Decisions	Classification: Open	Date: 14/07/09	Meeting Name: Walworth Community Council
Report title:		Local parking amendments (Q1)	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All wards within Walworth Community Council	
From:		Senior Engineer, Network Development	

RECOMMENDATION(S)

1. It is recommended that the local parking schemes detailed in the appendices to this report are approved for implementation subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory procedures.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. This report presents proposals for a number of local parking amendment schemes, which are matters reserved to Community Council for decision.
3. The origins and reasons for the proposals are discussed in the main body of the report.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Fauce Street (0910_Q1_038)

4. An application has been received by the network operations team for the installation of a disabled persons (blue badge) parking bay. The applicant met the necessary criteria for an origin, disabled persons parking bay.
5. The network development team has subsequently carried out a site visit to evaluate the network and ascertain the appropriate location for the disabled bay.
6. It is recommended that this disabled bay be installed in Fauce Street outside No.12 (appendix 1).

Iliffe Street (0910_Q1_041)

7. An application has been received by the network operations team for the installation of a disabled persons (blue badge) parking bay. The applicant met the necessary criteria for an origin, disabled persons parking bay.
8. The network development team has subsequently carried out a site visit to evaluate the network and ascertain the appropriate location for the disabled bay.
9. It is recommended that this disabled bay be installed in Iliffe Street outside No.10 (appendix 2).

Penton Place (0809_Q4_004)

Background

10. Network development received an enquiry in January 2009 from the London Fire Brigade (LFB) asking that the council to improve access through amendments to existing parking layouts in Penton Place.
11. Whilst attending an incident, an apartment fire, in a block of flats on Penton Place in December 2008 LFB were unable to proceed along Penton Place from Kennington Park Road due to vehicles parking on both sides of the highway. This resulted in the fire appliances having to be re-routed and crews that were first on site having to carry their equipment to the scene.
12. Penton Place is in West Walworth (E) Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and the section of street in which the problem occurred is between Kennington Park Road and Alberta Street.
13. At present the waiting restrictions (yellow lines), permit holders only and pay and display bays in Penton Place all operate Monday to Friday 8.30am to 6.30pm. Therefore, in the evening and at weekends the parking and waiting restrictions do not apply,
14. A network development officer and representative from the LFB carried out a site visit to observe the parking and kerb layout and ascertain what proposals would best resolve the issue.

Actions arising from Walworth Community Council, 10 June 2009

15. A report proposing amendments to the parking layout were first presented to Walworth Community Council (WCC) on 10 June 2009. The proposal was brought about through the council's local parking amendment programme.
16. WCC did not approve the Penton Place (0809Q4004) item at that meeting and asked that officers carry out consultation with residents of Alberta, Pullens, Newington and the Guinness trust prior to the return of the report for Member agreement.

Response

17. The established process for dealing with the type of request raised by LFB reflects the council's constitutional and statutory duties.
18. The process involves a network development engineer preparing a recommendation that is approved by the network manager. A report is then sent to the community council for Member's approval to progress to statutory consultation. This is in accordance with Part 3H of the council's constitution.
19. Once approved, statutory consultation is carried out in accordance with The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 and involves consultation with every member of the public by way of street and press notices.

20. There is a duty upon the council to consider any objections. Those that cannot be informally resolved will be determined by the community council.
21. Unfortunately, there is insufficient funding in the local parking amendment programme to carry out informal consultation for each item, prior to the report coming to community council, as was requested at the meeting 10 June 2009. It is estimated that by doing so the cost of the project would increase (and therefore overspend the budget available) by approximately 20-25%. The increase in cost would reflect the time and resources spent by officers preparing, distributing and analysing the consultation.

Proposal

22. A network development engineer made an evening (8pm) visit to Penton Place to ascertain the road widths, to evaluate the access point at Canterbury Place and to determine how much safe overnight parking would be lost by the original proposal. Safe parking is defined as parking that would not reduce the road width below 3.2m which is the minimum width that LFB require to gain access.
23. The results of this survey show that the section of Penton Place in question:
 - has a maximum width of 7.9m (at junction with Kennington Park Road)
 - has a minimum width of 5.7m (adjacent to Canterbury Place)
 - has existing CPZ parking bays with a width of between 2m and 1.9m
24. As previously mentioned the minimum width that the LFB require is 3.2m. Therefore to allow parking on both sides of the road (assuming a standard parking bay width of 2m) there needs to be a total carriageway width of 7.2m
25. This width is only maintained for the first 42m of Penton Place where there are existing CPZ bays on both sides – no change to these bays is proposed.
26. Beyond this point, parking bays on one side are mirrored by single yellow line on the other side.
27. It is this single yellow line that is proposed for upgrade to double yellow line and therefore it can be considered that the initial proposal does not reduce the amount of safe parking.
28. The evening site visit highlighted the obstruction caused by vehicles parked on the single yellow line (photo evidence available). It was noted that vehicles started to park on the single yellow line before all of the parking bays were full, it is assumed that motorists choose to park on the yellow line, knowing it was not enforceable, in order to park closer to their homes.
29. It was also observed that a large vehicle recovery lorry, proceeding northward up Penton Place, stopped past the junction with Alberta Street reversed and drove off down Alberta Street. It would appear that the driver, having seen the obstruction, ahead decided to use another route. This would certainly resemble LFBs previous problems.
30. It was also noted that in the immediate area there was an excess of available parking spaces in designated CPZ bays, particularly in Alberta Street, Iliffe Street and Peacock Street. These spaces which would compensate for the loss of safe and unsafe parking on Penton Place, though it may not be so convenient to

resident's homes.

31. It has been further proposed that the bay on the southwest side of Penton Place, opposite Canterbury Place be swapped to the northeast side. This has been proposed to provide a chicane effect of parking on either side and to ensure that the priority for oncoming vehicles is swapped at this point. This change in vehicle priority will act as a method of traffic calming (known as horizontal deflection) when the bays are parked in; rather than all parking on one side leading to a straight-line for vehicles traveling away from Kennington Park Road.
32. It has been noted that Canterbury Place has a gallow's gate leading from Penton Place. Whilst not an official dropped kerb it would appear that this route is used for access purposes (indicated by the presence of concrete to repair the back of footway).
33. In view of the preceding paragraph the proposals issued for 10 June 2009 have been revised to reduce the bay length by approximately 2 spaces (11m) and to maintain the access point for occasional maintenance purposes.

Duties

34. Under the Traffic Management Act (TMA) 2004, it is the duty of a local traffic authority to manage their road network with a view to achieving, so far as may be reasonably practicable having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives, the following objectives— securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network.
35. There is no explicit duty or policy for the authority to provide parking facilities on the public highway. The purpose of the highway is for the movement of all traffic (whether pedestrian, motorcyclist or emergency service vehicle).
36. It is regrettable that the demand (or the desire to park close to home) for parking space is such that it forces motorists to park unsafely. However, the authority does have a duty to manage the road network and considers that LFB access is of a higher priority than residential parking.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

37. In view of the duties upon the council and the financial constraints upon the budget, officers recommend that Members approve the scheme for progression to statutory consultation which will involve full public consultation by way of street and press notices,
38. The recommendations, detailed in Appendix 3, involve the change of CPZ-hours waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) to be replaced by at any time waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) and for the pay and display bay be moved from the southwest side outside Harold Maddison House to the northeast side outside Canterbury Place. This relocation of a parking bay would result in the loss of approximately 2 spaces (11m).
39. Should Members be minded not to lose these parking spaces then an alternative would be to upgrade the single yellow lines to double yellow lines but keep the bay on the southwest side in situ – this would, however, remove the benefits associated with staggered parking discussed in paragraph 31.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

40. The recommendations contained within this report are consistent with the policies of the PEP and associated Local Implementation Plan (LIP)
41. The proposals will support the council's equalities and human rights policies and will promote social inclusion by:
- providing origin disabled bays to assist residents with mobility impairments.
 - providing improved access for emergency vehicles, refuge vehicles, residents and visitors;
 - improving sight lines for all road users; and
 - improving junction and pedestrian safety, especially those with limited mobility or visual impairment.

COMMUNITY IMPACT STATEMENT

42. The policies within the Parking and Enforcement Plan are upheld within this report have been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA).

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

43. All costs arising from implementing the proposals, as set out in the report, will be fully contained within the existing local parking amendment budget.

CONSULTATION

44. No informal consultation has been carried out.
45. Should the community council approve the item, statutory consultation will take place as part of the making of the traffic management order. A proposal notice will be erected in proximity to the site location and a press notice will be published in the Southwark News and London Gazette. If there are objections a further report will be re-submitted to the community council for determination.
46. The road network and parking manager has been consulted on the proposals and has no objections.
47. No consultation or comment has been sought from the borough solicitor & secretary or the chief finance officer.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Parking and Enforcement Plan	Network development, Environment and Housing Department	Tim Walker 020 7525 2021

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Faunce Street – Proposed disabled persons parking place
Appendix 2	Iliffe Street – Proposed disabled persons parking place

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Tim Walker	
Report Author	Paul Gellard	
Version	1.1	
Dated	25/6/09	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director for Legal and Democratic Services	No	No
Finance Director	No	No
Parking operations and development manager	No	No
Network manager	Yes	No
Parking and network management business unit manager	Yes	No
Executive Member	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional/Community Council/Scrutiny Team	25/6/09	