

Item No 14.	Classification: Open	Date: 30 September 2013	Meeting Name: Peckham and Nunhead Community Council
Report title:		Local parking amendments	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All wards within Peckham and Nunhead Community Council	
From:		Head of Public Realm	

RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that the following local parking amendments, detailed in the appendices to this report, are approved for implementation subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory procedures:
 - Naylor Road – install one disabled persons’ (blue badge) parking bay.
 - Ivydale Road (No.7) – install one disabled persons’ (blue badge) parking bay
 - Ivydale Street (No.107) – install one disabled persons’ (blue badge) parking bay
 - Stuart Road – install one disabled persons’ (blue badge) parking bay
 - St Aidan’s Road – install one disabled persons’ (blue badge) parking bay
 - Machell Road – install one disabled persons’ (blue badge) parking bay
 - Kimberley Road – install one disabled persons’ (blue badge) parking bay
 - Forest Hill Road – extend the existing double yellow lines to the bus stop to improve sight lines at the junction with Honor Oak Rise
 - Elm Grove – remove one permit space and install a double yellow line to provide access to a planned new dropped kerb and vehicle crossover leading to No.52.
 - Rye Lane – change existing destination disabled parking place to a dual use (loading or disabled) place.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. Part 3H of the Southwark Constitution delegates decision making for non-strategic traffic management matters to the Community Council.
3. Paragraph 16 of Part 3H of the Southwark Constitution sets out that the Community Council will take decisions on the following local non-strategic matters:
 - the introduction of single traffic signs
 - the introduction of short lengths of waiting and loading restrictions

- the introduction of road markings
 - the introduction of disabled parking bays
 - the setting of consultation boundaries for consultation on traffic schemes
4. This report gives recommendations for ten local parking amendments, involving traffic signs and road markings.
 5. The origins and reasons for the recommendations are discussed within the key issues section of this report.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Origin disabled bays – Naylor Road, (7) Ivydale Road, (107) Ivydale Road, Stuart Road, St Aidan’s Road, Machell Road and Kimberley Avenue.

6. Seven applications have been received for the installation of disabled persons’ (blue badge) parking bays. In each case, the applicant met the necessary criteria for an origin, disabled persons’ parking bay.
7. An officer has subsequently carried out a site visit to evaluate the road network and carried out consultation with each applicant to ascertain the appropriate location for each disabled bay.
8. It is therefore recommended that disabled bays be installed at the following locations, see appendices for detailed design:

Reference	Bay location (approx)	Drawing appendix number
1314Q2005	Outside 58 Naylor Road	Appendix 1
1314Q2002	Outside 7 Ivydale Road	Appendix 2
1314Q2012	Outside 107 Ivydale Road	Appendix 3
1314Q2004	Outside 65 Stuart Road	Appendix 4
1314Q2023	Outside 47 St Aidan’s Road	Appendix 5
1314Q2025	Outside 12 Machell Road	Appendix 6
1314Q2026	Outside 16 Kimberley Avenue	Appendix 7

Forest Hill Road – 1314Q2017

9. The council was contacted by a resident of Honor Oak Rise. They inform us that sight lines at the junction of Forest Hill Road and Honor Oak Rise are poor as vehicles are parking between the end of the at any time waiting restrictions and the bus stop.
10. An officer visited this location, 2 July 2013 and found no vehicles were parked causing an obstruction to the sight lines at this junction.
11. However it was noted that if vehicles were to park on the section of uncontrolled highway between the existing double yellow lines and the bus stop, this would certainly reduce the view of on-coming vehicles.
12. The break in restriction is approximately 4 metres and is long enough that small vehicles can park without committing an offence.
13. Vehicles parked at or close to a junction have two primary effects upon the road network: a reduction in visibility between road users and a reduction in the

effective space of the carriageway for vehicles to turn.

14. Ensuring adequate visibility between road users is important to safety. Visibility should generally be sufficient to allow road users to see potential conflicts or dangers in advance of the distance in which they will be able to break and come to a stop.
15. Vehicles that are parked at a junction have the effect of substantially reducing visibility between road users and reducing stopping sight distance (SSD) which is the viewable distance required for a driver to see so that they can make a complete stop before colliding with something in the street, eg pedestrian, cyclist or a stopped vehicle.
16. It is noted that almost two thirds of cyclists killed or seriously injured in 2012 were involved in collisions at, or near, a road junction, with T junctions being the most commonly involved.
17. Children and those in wheelchairs (whose eyelevel is below the height of a parked car) are disproportionately affected by vehicles parked too close to a junction. The Guide Dogs for the Blind Association (Guide Dogs) strongly recommend that yellow lines are implemented at junctions as these areas are potentially more dangerous.
18. The Highway Code makes clear that motorists must not park within 10 metres of a junction, unless in a designated bay. However the council has no power to enforce this without the introduction of a traffic order and subsequent implementation of waiting restrictions (yellow lines).
19. The proposal to install yellow lines at this junction is proposed in accordance with the council's adopted [Southwark Streetscape Design Manual \(SSDM\)](#) standards.
20. In view of the above and the need to keep the clear view at the junction of Forest Hill Road and Honor Oak Rise it is recommended that the double yellow lines are extended, as detailed in Appendix 8, to the bus stop.

Elm Grove - 1314Q20018

21. The council's asset management team have received, considered and approved in principle (subject to this decision and statutory consultation) the construction of a dropped kerb and vehicle crossover leading to No. 52 Elm Grove.
22. The proposed crossover location currently has a permit holder only parking bay in front of it, this bay is part of Peckham (B) Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).
23. It is not possible to maintain a parking bay and dropped kerb at the same location as the presence of both would provide a conflicting message to motorists.
24. Officers are proposing to progress a local parking amendment such that the parking bay is removed and a waiting restriction (double yellow line) is installed; this will result in the loss of approximately one parking space.
25. Double yellow lines prohibit waiting (generally referred to as parking) 'at any time' however loading and unloading is permitted.
26. It is noted that double yellow lines are now the council's standard restriction for

crossovers located within a parking zone. This is part of a wider objective to reduce sign clutter and to improve comprehension of restrictions at the point of parking.

27. It is recommended, as shown in Appendix 9 that the bay marking outside No. 52 is removed and 7 metres of double yellow line is installed.

Rye Lane - 1314Q2029

28. During 2010/11 public realm improvements were made at the junction of Rye Lane, Heaton Road and Copeland Road that included the widening of the footway outside the Nags Head public house, 231 – 235 Rye Lane.
29. The footway widening had the unintended consequence of reducing the availability for kerb-side loading and unloading to the public house.
30. The existing parking restrictions in proximity to the public house prohibit loading and, as such, deliveries being made to the premises are currently taking place in the adjacent destination disabled parking place.
31. Recent relaxations in the traffic signs regulations, now provide the council with the option to provide a dual use bay that operates differently at different times of the day.
32. Following discussion with the public house about their times of delivery (some of which are within their control but most are not) it is recommended that, as shown in Appendix 10, the existing restriction is changed so that the bay operates as follows:
 - 7am to 11am – Loading only, max stay 40 mins.
 - All other times – Blue badge holders, max stay 4 hours.

Policy implications

33. The recommendations contained within this report are consistent with the policies of the Transport Plan 2011, particularly

Policy 1.1 – pursue overall traffic reduction

Policy 4.2 – create places that people can enjoy.

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

Community impact statement

34. The policies within the Transport Plan are upheld within this report have been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment.
35. The recommendations are area based and therefore will have greatest affect upon those people living, working or traveling in the vicinity of the areas where the proposals are made.
36. The introduction of blue badge parking gives direct benefit to disabled motorists, particularly to the individual who has applied for that bay.
37. The introduction of yellow lines at junctions gives benefit to all road users through

the improvement of inter-visibility and therefore road safety.

38. There is a risk that new restrictions may cause parking to be displaced and, indirectly, have an adverse impact upon road users and neighboring properties at that location. However this cannot be predicted until the recommendations have been implemented and observed.
39. With the exception of those benefits and risks identified above, the recommendations are not considered to have a disproportionate affect on any other community or group.
40. The recommendations support the council's equalities and human rights policies and promote social inclusion by:
 - Providing improved parking facilities for blue badge (disabled) holders in proximity to their homes.
 - Providing improved access for key services such as emergency and refuge vehicles.
 - Improving road safety, in particular for vulnerable road users, on the public highway.

Resource implications

41. All costs arising from implementing the recommendations will be fully contained within the existing public realm budgets.

Legal implications

42. Traffic Management Orders would be made under powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984.
43. 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.
44. These regulations also require the Council to consider any representations received as a result of publishing the draft order for a period of 21 days following publication of the draft order.
45. Should any objections be received they must be properly considered in the light of administrative law principles, Human Rights law and the relevant statutory powers.
46. By virtue of section 122, the Council must exercise its powers under the RTRA 1984 so as to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic including pedestrians, and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway.
47. These powers must be exercised so far as practicable having regard to the following matters
 - a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises
 - b) the effect on the amenities of any locality affected including the regulation and restriction of heavy commercial traffic so as to preserve or improve amenity

- c) the national air quality strategy
- d) facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and securing the safety and convenience of their passengers
- e) any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.

Consultation

- 48. No informal (public) consultation has been carried out.
- 49. Where consultation with stakeholders has been completed, this is described within the key issues section of the report.
- 50. Should the community council approve the items, statutory consultation will take place as part of the making of the traffic management order. The process for statutory consultation is defined by national regulations.
- 51. The council will place a proposal notice in proximity to the site location and also publish the notice in the Southwark News and the London Gazette.
- 52. The notice and any associated documents and plans will also be made available for inspection on the council’s website or by appointment at its Tooley Street office.
- 53. Any person wishing to comment upon or object to the proposed order will have 21 days in which do so.
- 54. Should an objection be made that officers are unable to informally resolve, this objection will be reported to the community council for determination, in accordance with the Southwark Constitution.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Transport Plan 2011	Southwark Council Environment and Leisure Public Realm projects Parking design 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH Online: http://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/200107/transport_policy/1947/southwark_transport_plan_2011	Tim Walker 020 7525 2021

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	58 Naylor Road – proposed origin disabled bay
Appendix 2	7 Ivydale Road – proposed origin disabled bay
Appendix 3	107 Ivydale Road – proposed origin disabled bay
Appendix 4	65 Stuart Road – proposed origin disabled bay
Appendix 5	47 St Aidan's Road– proposed origin disabled bay
Appendix 6	12 Machell Road – proposed origin disabled bay
Appendix 7	16 Kimberley Avenue– proposed origin disabled bay
Appendix 8	Forest Hill Road – proposed at any time waiting restrictions
Appendix 9	Elm Grove – proposed at any time waiting restrictions
Appendix 10	Rye Lane – proposed dual use loading and disabled bay

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Des Waters, Head of Public Realm	
Report Author	Tim Walker, Senior Engineer	
Version	Final	
Dated	16 September 2013	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Director of Legal Services	No	No
Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services	No	No
Cabinet Member	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	18 September 2013	