

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 08/12/09	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Bermondsey Community Council
<b>Report title:</b>		London Bridge (F) and Bermondsey (G) Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) Reviews	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		All wards	
<b>From:</b>		Tim Walker	

### **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

It is recommended that, subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory process, the following items are approved:

1. parking amendments detailed in appendices 16 and 154 to this report ; and
2. implementation of double yellow lines on all junctions within F and G CPZs, as discussed in paragraphs 152 to 154.

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

3. Bermondsey (G) CPZ and London Bridge (F) were introduced, following public consultation, in 1998 to manage the many competing demands for parking in a central London area.
4. Both zones were subsequently reviewed in 2003 to amend the boundary between them to reflect Transport for London's introduction of central London congestion charging.
5. Since 2003 various local parking amendments have been made to address minor road network concerns, with approval sought through the community council.
6. The council initiated a programme of proposing new and reviewing existing CPZs within its Parking and Enforcement Plan (PEP) in areas where it is considered to be in the interests of local residents and businesses, to discourage unnecessary car use, improve the street environment, to increase safety for all road users and balance the demand for residents and visitors.
7. Although these reviews are not full CPZ reviews (with consultation of every resident within the zone involved) it does provide opportunity to consolidate a significant number of issues raised since the last review and also take account of new policies adopted within the PEP in 2007.
8. The project has provided opportunity to carry out informal consultation upon issues raised, so as to ascertain the true level of community concern and support.
9. It is noted that the reviews of adjacent F (London Bridge) and Bermondsey (G) CPZs were carried out simultaneously.

### **CONSULTATION**

10. Prior to project commencement, Bermondsey community council was briefed on the scope of the study on 13 January 2009.
11. Officers then carried out site observations and prepared initial designs. The

consultation boundaries and documents were subsequently agreed with ward members in August 2009.

12. Informal consultation was carried out between 2 October 2009 and 30 October 2009.
13. Consultation documents were sent via Royal Mail to all properties that were directly affected by the proposals. These documents are enclosed as Appendix 1 to 12 to this report.
14. Respondents were asked to email or use a freepost address to make comment on the proposed changes. The responses to this consultation are summarised in the main body of the report.
15. Should the recommendations be approved (or revised and approved) statutory consultation will take place as part of the making of the traffic management order, in accordance with the Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. A proposal notice will be erected in proximity to the each site location and a press notice will be published in the Southwark News and London Gazette. If there are objections the proposal or a modified proposal will be re-submitted to the community council.

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **Barnham Street / Druid Street / Holyrood Street / Magdalen Street / Potters Fields / Shand Street (Zone F CPZ)**

16. Network development sent out 416 consultation documents (Appendix 1) to residents and businesses in the local area on local parking amendments.
17. 7 representations were received from residents in the area regarding the proposals.
  - **Barnham Street**
18. The current parking arrangement in Barnham Street, allow for motorist to load and unload on the existing double yellow lines for up to 40 minutes. Blue badge holders are also permitted to park on the double yellow lines for up to 3 hours.
19. The Network Development team received concerns from the London Fire Brigade in August 2008 regarding emergency vehicular access in Barnham Street, They stated that they would not support the implementation of any additional parking bays on the west side of Barnham Street as it would obstruct their access along the road.
20. The Barnham Street carriageway is narrow and measures an average of 4 meters, kerb to kerb.
21. With legal parking (by staff permit holders) and permitted loading/unloading currently taking place, a width of only 2 meters is left between parked vehicles and the kerb for vehicular access.
22. It should be noted that the London Fire Brigade Fire Safety Guidance Note – Access for Fire Appliances Number GN29 require a minimum of 3.2 meters

between parked vehicles for access.

23. Officers have also observed vehicles mounting the footway to gain vehicle access along Barnham Street, raising concerns about pedestrian safety and causing damage to the footway.
24. Two representations were received and considered from residents regarding the proposals in Barnham Street as shown in appendix 13.
25. Based on officer observations and comments made by the emergency services and residents, it is recommended that the parking proposals in Barnham Street are amended so that the loading ban only extends for approx the 15m only from its junction with Tooley Street.
26. It is therefore recommended that the scheme be approved for implementation as shown in appendix 15.

- **Druid Street**

27. The current parking arrangement in the section of Druid Street, by the junction of Tooley Street provides a loading facility for up to 40 minutes on the existing single yellow line adjacent to The Bridge Lounge PH.
28. It is proposed to covert all single yellow lines to at any time waiting restrictions in the section of Druid Street by the junction of Tooley Street
29. This will still provide a facility to load and unload for up to 40 minutes whilst meeting on borough-wide initiative to reduce street clutter through the removal of large (1m<sup>2</sup>) CPZ entry/end signs.
30. Network development received no comments on this proposal.
31. It is recommended that the proposal shown in appendix 15 of installing "At any time" waiting restrictions is approved.

- **Holyrood Street / Magdalen Street**

32. The current parking arrangement in Holyrood Street and Magdalen Street provides no parking provision for residents.
33. At present the carriageway is controlled by single yellow lines, operating zone hours.
34. Officers observed that there is scope to install zone F permit holder only bays on the east side of Holyrood Street, creating 6 spaces for residents. This proposal reflects general comments made within the zone that permit parking provision is very low. It was also noted that the bay on the southern side of Magdalen Street is currently undesignated and can be extended by 5 meters, to create an additional parking space.
35. It is also proposed to upgrade the single yellow lines in Holyrood Street and Magdalen Street to double yellow lines, this will still provide a facility to load and unload for up to 40 minutes and, as discussed in paragraph 29, reduce street clutter.

36. Three representations were received and considered from residents in Holyrood Street and Magdalen Street as shown in appendix 13.

37. It is recommended to progress with the proposals as shown in appendix 15.

- **Potters Fields**

38. Potters Field's is public highway and Southwark is the highway and traffic authority. However, at present parking is not regulated due to historical reasons of red-route introduction (TLRN)

39. The Network Development team was contacted by the Potters Fields Park Management Trust in July 2009 regarding the parking arrangements in Potters Fields.

40. Concerns were raised that parking is taking place all day making loading and unloading difficult and preventing emergency access to the park.

41. Network development received one representation supporting the proposals.

42. It is therefore recommended to install a loading bay operating at any time, and install at any time waiting restrictions as shown in appendix 15.

- **Shand Street**

43. The Network Development team consulted all properties in Shand Street on the proposed installation of at any time waiting restrictions and the installation of a zone F permit holders only bay.

44. It is proposed to make the existing undesignated parking bay located under the railway bridge zone F permit holders only. It is also proposed to reduce the parking by 5 meters, to improve visibility and vehicle and pedestrian at the 'pinch-point'.

45. It is also proposed to upgrade the single yellow lines in Shand Street to double yellow lines, this will still provide a facility to load and unload for up to 40 minutes and reduce on street clutter as zone entry/end signs will no longer be required.

46. One representation was received and considered from a resident regarding the proposals in Shand Street as shown in appendix 13.

47. It is recommended to progress with the proposals as shown in appendix 15.

**Bermondsey Street / Lamb Walk / Leathermarket Street / Morocco Street / Tanner Street / White's Ground (Zone F CPZ)**

48. Network development sent out 296 consultation documents (Appendix 2) to residents and businesses in the local area.

49. 8 representations were received from residents in the area regarding the proposals.

- **Bermondsey Street**

50. The current parking arrangement in the Bermondsey Street area provides a mixture of parking places for its residents, businesses and short stay visitors.
51. It is proposed to make a number of changes to the existing parking arrangements in Bermondsey Street to accommodate and further improve the parking needs for residents and visitors.
52. The parking proposals in Bermondsey Street include:
  - Extending the solo motorcycle bay outside no.s 136 – 140.
  - Relocate the permit holder's only bay outside no.132 to outside no. 126 – 128, to ensure pedestrian crossing to the park in maintained.
  - Make the undesignated bay outside no.s 114 -118 permit holders only
  - Introduce pay and display by the junction of White's Ground to provide turnover in space for visitors.
  - Install double yellow lines at the junction of Tyers Gate and Tanner Street to improve vehicle and pedestrian access.
53. Five representations were received and considered from residents in the area as shown in appendix 13.
54. Based on officer observations and comments made by residents, it is recommended that the parking proposals in Bermondsey Street be amended and approved for implementation as shown in appendix 16.
55. It is further noted that we will take the opportunity to install ground anchors within the existing motorcycle bay, to provide a secure parking option for motorcyclists.
  - **Lamb Walk**
56. The Network Development team consulted all properties in Lamb Walk on the proposed removal of the parking bay located by the junction of Morocco Street.
57. Officers observed the carriageway is particularly narrow towards the junction of Morocco Street and access would prove difficult in the case of an emergency.
58. The network development team received two representations relating to this proposal with one resident supporting the proposal and a resident concerned about the loss of parking the proposal will cause.
59. Due to narrow width of the carriageway and the importance of emergency access being maintained, it is recommended that the proposal shown in appendix 16 of installing "At any time" waiting restrictions in place of the parking bay is approved.
  - **Leathermarket Street and Morocco Street**
60. The section of Leathermarket Street and Morocco Street by the junction of Bermondsey Street currently provides provision to load and unload as well as short term parking creating turnover in space for visitors to the area.
61. The Network Development team is proposing to make amendments to the parking at this junction to accommodate the parking needs for our visitors and to

improve vehicle access.

#### Waiting and loading

62. It is proposed to remove the loading ban (double kerb blips) and extend the double yellow lines to improve vehicle and pedestrian safety at the junction
63. The removal of the loading ban will enable loading and unloading to take place for up to 40 minutes on the double yellow lines.

#### Parking places

64. It is proposed to remove the time restricted free bay located outside no. 1 Morocco Street and replace with a disabled persons parking space and extend the solo motorcycle bay, and at the same time install ground anchors to provide a secure parking option for motorcyclists.
65. It is also proposed to convert the meters bays located outside no.4 Leathermarket Street to pay and display.
66. Two representations were received and considered from residents in the area as shown in appendix 13.
67. It is proposed to progress with the proposals as shown in appendix 16.

#### • **Tanner Street and White's Grounds**

68. Officers have identified locations in the section of Tanner Street and White's Grounds by the junction of Bermondsey Street as areas to create additional parking space.
69. The network development team is proposing to install a destination disabled bay, with a maximum stay of 4 hours on the northern side of Tanner Street, close to the junction of Bermondsey Street to create turnover of space for blue badge visitors to the area.
70. Officers also noted from site observations that there is scope to extend the permit holders only bay outside no.2 White's Ground, creating an additional parking space.
71. Network development received no comments relating to these proposals.
72. It is recommended that the proposal shown in appendix 16 is approved.

#### **Bermondsey Wall East (Zone G CPZ)**

73. The current parking arrangement provides no opportunity for casual or visitor parking. The initial proposal will provide short term paid-for parking for visitors to local residents, businesses, the river and its attractions.
74. Network development received requests from a local ward member and businesses to provide short term parking to assist visitors to the area.
75. The proposal (see appendix 3) is to convert the existing 81.5 metres of permit

holder bays (2 parking places) to shared use (permit and 4 hour pay and display) to increase short term parking for visitors to local residents, businesses, the river and its attractions.

76. The new shared-use bays (permit and 4 hour pay and display) will also provide additional, free parking for blue badge (disabled) holders. The 4 hour time limit for the pay and display will discourage commuter parking as it is recognised that this location is near to the Bermondsey underground station.
77. Network development received 2 responses (see appendix 14). 1 response was negative stating that too much of the permit parking was being converted and that the existing permit holder's parking was under pressure. The other response supported the proposal stating it would make it easier for visitors and trades person to park.
78. Network development engineers have visited this location several times and found the permit holder's bay to be under utilised during the operating times of the CPZ. In view of this it not considered that additional visitor parking (limited to a maximum stay of 4 hours) would not adversely affect resident permit holders.
79. The provision of shared-use parking bays is supported within the PEP<sup>1</sup> for this particular zone.
80. In view of the comments received, site observations and the policy context it is recommended that the detailed design (see appendix 17) to convert the existing permit bays to shared use bays is approved.

#### **Bevington Street and Scott Lidgett Crescent (Zone G CPZ)**

81. Bevington Street is parallel and Scott Lidgett Crescent is adjacent to Jamaica Road which has a small local high street. Jamaica Road is TRLN and the loading/unloading for the shop has to take place on Scott Lidgett Crescent. The closest available location for short term paid for parking is Bevington Street north of its junction with Scott Lidgett Crescent.
82. The current traffic management order states that the existing bays on Bevington Street at the junction with Scott Lidgett Crescent are time restricted free bay and pay and display. The present situation causes confusion for the motorist as there is no pay and display machine and the signage is poor.
83. Network development sent out 45 consultation documents to residents and businesses in the local area.
84. Network development received no comment on the proposals.
  - Bevington Street
85. Although current parking arrangement provides opportunity for casual or visitor parking, the bays are open to long stay commuters ( the bay are a short distance for the Bermondsey underground station) as parking operations are unable to enforce the bays due to no or poor signage. Our proposals will provide short term paid for parking for visitors to local residents and the businesses on Jamaica

---

<sup>1</sup> Parking and Enforcement Plan, Section 6.1, Table 5

## Road

86. The proposal (see appendix 4) is to convert the existing 51.5 metres of unrestricted free bays to shared use (permit and 4 hour pay and display) and to extend the existing permit bay by 22 metres to increase short term parking for visitors to local residents and businesses and parking availability for residents.

- Scott Lidgett Crescent

87. The current parking arrangement provides limited opportunity for loading/unloading as the loading bay dimensions are incorrect. The local shopping high street on Jamaica Road junction Bevington Street only loading opportunity is the bay on Scott Lidgett Crescent.
88. The proposal (see appendix 4) is to relocate the existing loading bay 5 metres along the carriageway to provide better loading only facilities. At present the bay width is 2m, this restricts availability to larger vehicles.
89. It is recommended that the proposal shown in appendix 18 of converting the existing pay and display bays be converted to a shared use bay and the proposed relocation of the loading only bay is approved.

## **Curlew Street (Zone G CPZ)**

90. The current loading/unloading arrangements provide limited opportunity for deliveries to residents on Shad Thames and surrounding streets, such as Curlew Street, Maguire Street and Lafone Street. The Shad Thames resident association and individual residents have made request to network development asking for a loading only bay on Curlew Street.
91. The concern raised by residents is that when trades people or deliveries of large items are taking place the drivers occasionally receive penalty charge notices while away from the vehicle (as no loading activity is evident). Curlew Street has at any time waiting restrictions along its entire length and therefore allows loading/unloading to take place for up 40 minutes provided it is evident, Where a PCN is issued and a resulting appeal provides supporting evidence that a delivery was taking place the council will, of course, cancel the PCN
92. Network development also want to ensure that access is maintained into Shad Thames at all times (whether the pedestrianisation gate is open or not) for the purposes of delivery and emergency access.
93. The activity of loading/unloading does result in a certain amount of noise. This has been reported by residents of Curlew Street as a problem particularly over night and in the early morning.
94. The Shad Thames area is made up of narrow streets which serve as a reminder of its industrial past. At present there is only 1 loading facility adjacent to the design museum. Loading is controlled along the section of Shad Thames from Horsleydown Lane to Maguire Street via locked gates that only allow access from 8am to 11am and 4.30pm to 6pm. Demand for parking in the remaining streets within the Shad Thames area is at a premium

95. The initial proposal (see appendix 5) was to install an “At any time” loading only bay on the west side of the carriageway to assist deliveries, particular those being made into the pedestrianised stretch of Shad Thames (to Butlers Wharf, etc).
96. Network development sent out 174 consultation documents to residents and businesses in the local area.
97. Network development received 32 responses. 3 of the respondents support the proposal. 29 respondents oppose the proposal on the grounds that the “at any time” loading only bay would encourage loading (and resulting noise) all night, see comments in appendix 14.
98. There, perhaps, is some misunderstanding in the reason for the proposed operational hours of the bay. A bay that operates “at any time” means that the bay can only be used for its specific purpose (in this case loading) 24/7.
99. Where a bay operates for a shorter time period (as was suggested by some respondents for 9am-6pm) this would mean that anyone could park in that bay outside of the controlling hours (ie overnight - 6pm to 9am).
100. The objective was not to increase parking provision in Curlew Street but to improve loading availability. Therefore a bay that operates less than 24hrs will increase parking in the area which will result in reduced capacity for loading.
101. Having carefully considered the comments received, the proposal (detailed in appendix 19) is revised so that:
  - A ban upon loading “at any time” is installed in Curlew Street at its northern most extent. This will ensure access is maintained into the pedestrianised area.
  - Information that loading is permitted on yellow lines is made more wide-spread and that the current double yellow lines provide a reasonable balance of restriction. Dispensations to load/unload for longer periods of time are also available from the council’s Parking Shop.
  - Parking operations are reminded that deliveries to residential properties in this area may take a little longer due to distance between highway and delivery location.
102. It is therefore recommended the proposals shown in appendix 19 are approved.

**Dockhead (Zone G CPZ)**

103. The current parking arrangement provides no opportunity for visitor parking, a local ward member passed on requests from their constituents concerning short term paid for parking.
104. The proposal (see appendix 6) is to convert the existing permit bay into a shared use (permits and 4 hour pay and display) bay.
105. Network development sent out 15 consultation documents to residents and businesses in the local area.

106. Network development received no comment on this proposal.
107. Dockhead has a number of small local shops which at present has no parking availability other than 2 small free bays on the TRLN (red route). The remaining parking availability is for residents.
108. It is recommended that the proposal (see appendix 20) shown in appendix 7 of converting the existing pay and display bays to shared use (permits and 4 hour pay and display) bay is approved.

### **Druid Street (Zone G CPZ)**

109. There are no current parking restrictions on the south side of Druid Street along the railway arch frontages between Abbey Street and Tanner Street. This situation has led to vehicles parking at 90° to the kerb reducing the carriageway and restricting the flow of traffic.
110. Both sides of Druid Street are within the existing Bermondsey (G) CPZ. The north side is restricted. Network development received a number of complaints from local residents including the Arnold Estate tenants and residents association.
111. The main concern was the access into Druid Street at the junction with Abbey Street. Vehicles are being parked at 90 ° to the kerb makes access for large vehicles, particularly refuse and emergency vehicles, difficult.
112. The original proposal (appendix 7) was to introduce waiting restrictions on the south side of the carriageway in the existing Bermondsey (G) CPZ by installing an “at any time” waiting restriction (double yellow lines) along the front of the railway arches between Abbey Street and Tanner Street.
113. Network development sent out 45 consultation documents to residents and businesses in the local area. .
114. Network development received 2 responses and 1 petition. Network Rail property agents, Spacia, and a number of traders from the arches on Druid Street raised concern regarding the enforcement of the proposed “at any time” waiting restrictions. They feel that there would not be enough flexibility with the enforcement and this may have a detrimental effect on their businesses, see comments appendix 14.
115. An engineer from network development met with representatives from Spacia and the traders to discuss options for restriction along the arches frontages.
116. Two main alternatives were suggested by the traders to the proposed. A) Installing a loading only bay. B) Installing very short lengths (~3m) of double yellow line between the arches,
117. The latter suggestion was considered by officers but it was considered that this would result in an increase of (unknown) vehicles parking in front of the businesses’ archways, restricting access with no enforcement options open to the council. More critically, from a road network perspective, it would not prevent the unacceptable behavior of 90 ° parking.

118. The former suggestion is considered a reasonable compromise though it is noted that should vehicles park in the bay the council will be unable to relocate the vehicle if they are obstructing the arch entrance.
119. Another further issue was raised at the meeting in relation to a Druid Street free parking bay close to the junction with Abbey Street. Traders stated that large vehicles (emergency and refuse) had trouble turning left into Druid Street. This was caused by the 2 hour time restricted free bay outside community centre. Network development have modeled the junction with a large rigid vehicle and found that the bay should be reduced by 7 metres.
120. It is recommended that loading only bays are installed in front of the arches and the 2 hour time restricted free bay is approved as (detailed in appendix 21)

### **Drummond Road and Clement's Road (Zone G CPZ)**

121. The current parking arrangement provides no opportunity for visitor parking to local residents and businesses and the play group on the Tower Bridge business complex.
122. At present there are only permit holder bays on Drummond Road between Southwark Park Road and Clement's Road. A local ward member and a play group asked that a short term parking be considered.
123. The proposal (appendix 8) is that the existing permit holder's bays on the southwest side of Drummond Road and the north side of Clement's Road be converted to a shared use bay (permit and 4 hour pay and display). This will assist visitors to the Tower Bridge Trading complex, local shops, blue disabled badge holders and visitors to a local play group who at present have limited parking availability
124. Network development sent out 199 consultation documents to residents and businesses in the local area.
125. Network development received 2 responses and expresses support for the proposal, see comments appendix 14.
126. It is recommended that the proposal shown in appendix 22 of converting the existing permit holder bays to shared use (permits and 4 hour pay and display) bay is approved.

### **Kipling Street (Zone F CPZ)**

127. The parking place located outside 13-50 Locker Estate in Kipling Street are currently designated permit holders only. There are also two single meters located by the junction of Porlock Street.
128. Officers observed that the bays are rarely parked to capacity and that converting the bays to shared use will create turnover in short term parking for visitors while maintaining space for residents.
129. The network development team are proposing to convert the two single meter bays and the zone F permit holders only bays situated outside 13-50 Lockyer Estate to shared use (permit holders and pay and display)

130. Network development sent out 82 consultation documents (Appendix 9) to residents and businesses in the local area.
131. Network development received no responses.
132. It is recommended that the proposal shown in appendix 23 of installing shared use is approved.

#### **Long Lane (Zone F CPZ)**

133. There is currently a time restricted free bay located outside the parade of shops, 154 – 162 Long Lane.
134. At present the bay operates Monday to Saturday, 10am to 4pm, with a maximum stay of 30 minutes, no return within 90 minutes.
135. The Network Development team sent consultation documents (Appendix 10) to property no.s 154 -162 Long Lane on changing the hours the bay operates, to make it consistent with other time restricted free bays in the area.
136. It is proposed to change the hours of the bay to operate, Monday to Saturday, 8am to 6.30pm, 30 minutes maximum stay, no return within 2 hours.
137. Network development received no responses to the consultation, therefore It is proposed to progress with the proposal as shown in appendix 25.

#### **Queen Elizabeth Street (Zone G CPZ)**

138. The current parking arrangement provides no opportunity for loading/unloading.
139. Queen Elizabeth Street is within the Shad Thames area. There are no formal loading facilities resulting in delivery vehicles of all sizes stopping on yellow line restrictions and footways to load/unload. This causes obstructions to the flow of traffic, damage to parked vehicles and footways. The demand for loading/unloading, short term paid for parking and a resident parking is high.
140. This is an issue raised by engineers from network development after on site observations and concerns expressed by the Shad Thames residents association regarding footway parking by vehicles delivering to shops and businesses along Queen Elizabeth Street.
141. The proposal (appendix 11) is to convert the existing pay and display bays and install a loading only bay also to convert the existing permit bay to a shared use bay (permits and 4 hour pay and display). This will improve loading as well increasing parking availability for visitors to the local residents and businesses and blue disabled badge holders.
142. Network development sent out 385 consultation documents to residents and businesses in the local area.
143. Network development received 4 responses. 1 supported the introduction of the loading only bay the other 3 responses did not, expressing concerns about the noise they felt it would generate, see comments appendix 15.

144. It is recommended that the proposal shown in appendix 26 of converting the existing permit holder bays to shared use (permits and 4 hour pay and display) bay and introducing a loading only bay is approved based upon the lack of legitimate loading opportunities in this area which results in problems of obstruction and lack of compliance.

### **Southwark Park Road (Zone G CPZ)**

145. The current parking arrangement provides limited opportunity parents to drop off and pick up children from the nursery. There is a permit bay outside the nursery and a time restricted free bay opposite.
146. The parents are reluctant to use the time restricted free bay as this means they have to cross a busy road.
147. Network development was asked by the nursery and a ward member to improve availability of dropping off and picking up from the nursery. The nursery is opposite an estate that has its own permit scheme.
148. The proposal (appendix 12) is to convert the unrestricted free bay on the east side of the highway to permit holders only and the existing permit holders bay on the west side (outside the nursery) of the highway to change to shared use (permits and 15 min free) bay.
149. Network development sent out 27 consultation documents to residents and businesses in the local area.
150. Network development received one response (appendix 14) though it did not relate to the proposals
151. It is recommended that the proposal shown in appendix 27 of converting the existing permit holder bays to shared use (permits and 15 minute free) bay and the 30 minute time restricted free bay converted to a permit holder's bay is approved.

### **CPZ WIDE PROPOSALS**

152. In line with current council practice we recommend that all road junctions within Bermondsey (G) zone and London bridge (F) zone have the existing zone hours waiting restriction (single yellow line) upgraded to an "at any time" waiting restriction (double yellow line)
153. This recommendation will ensure that sufficient sight lines are maintained at all times on road junctions. This has significant safety benefits for all road users (including pedestrians wishing to cross the road). The recommendation reflects Rule 243 of the Highway Code and ensures that vehicles with a larger turning circle (i.e. refuge and fire brigade vehicles) are able to negotiate all road junctions.
154. Further checks will also be made to ensure that all parking signage is compliant with the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002 (TSRGD 2002) and where possible we will de-clutter redundant parking related street furniture.

## **POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

155. The recommendations contained within this report are consistent with the policies of the PEP and associated Local Implementation Plan (LIP).

## **COMMUNITY IMPACT STATEMENT**

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

## **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

157. The Head of Public Realm has confirmed that any costs arising from implementing the proposals, as set out in the report, will be fully contained within the existing budget.

## **LEGAL CONCURRENT**

158. Community Council is being asked to approve the changes to the London Bridge F and the Bermondsey (G) CPZ as outlined in the recommendation.
159. Consultation for the above changes took place between 2-30 October and Bermondsey Community Council was initially briefed on the plans in January 2009. Members are being asked to approve the recommendation in accordance with Paragraphs 16 & 17 of Part 3H of the Constitution which deal with the decision making aspect of this recommendation and also the determination of the objections following the informal consultation.
160. If Community Council approves the recommendation then the Council will commence making the relevant Traffic Orders which will trigger a separate statutory consultation process.
161. The Council has powers under Part I of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to make traffic management orders to bring about or amend a Controlled Parking Zone, including experimental orders, subject to compliance with the relevant procedural requirements under the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 .
162. In exercising its powers, Section 122 of the Act imposes a duty on the Council to have regard (in so far as practicable) to securing 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'. The Council must also have regard to such matters as the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to the premises and the effect on the amenities of any locality affected.
163. The traffic management orders cannot be implemented without first completing the appropriate consultation, publication / notification of intent to introduce Traffic Management Orders and in the case of experimental orders providing an opportunity for evaluation by the Police. The public are also ordinarily notified by way of street and press notices. Although in the case of some orders these procedures are simplified.
164. The council has the power to overrule objections, but must first consider all the

representations received, and satisfy itself that its actions are reasonable in all the circumstances. In some instances unresolved objections may result in a public inquiry to consider whether the order should be made.

#### **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

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

## APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Barnham Street / Druid Street / Holyrood Street / Magdalen Street / Potters Field / Shand Street (Zone F) - Consultation document and initial design
Appendix 2	Bermondsey Street / Lamb Walk / Leathermarket Street / Morocco Street / Tanner Street / White's Grounds (Zone F) - Consultation document and initial design
Appendix 3	Bermondsey Wall East (zone G) - Consultation document and initial design
Appendix 4	Bevington Street & Scott Lidgett Crescent (Zone G) - Consultation document and initial design
Appendix 5	Curlew Street (Zone G) - Consultation document and initial design
Appendix 6	Dockhead (Zone G) - Consultation document and initial design
Appendix 7	Druid Street (Zone G) - Consultation document and initial design
Appendix 8	Drummond Road and Clement's Road (Zone G) - Consultation document and initial design
Appendix 9	Kipling Street (Zone F) - Consultation document and initial design
Appendix 10	Long Lane (Zone F) - Consultation document and initial design
Appendix 11	Queen Elizabeth Street (Zone G) - Consultation document and initial design
Appendix 12	Southwark Park Road (Zone G) - Consultation document and initial design
Appendix 13	Consultation comments (zone F)
Appendix 14	Consultation comments (zone G)
Appendix 15	Barnham Street / Druid Street / Holyrood Street / Magdalen Street / Potters Field / Shand Street (Zone F) - recommended detailed design
Appendix 16	Bermondsey Street / Lamb Walk / Leathermarket Street / Morocco Street / Tanner Street / White's Grounds (Zone F) - recommended detailed design
Appendix 17	Bermondsey Wall East (zone G) - recommended detailed design
Appendix 18	Bevington Street & Scott Lidgett Crescent (Zone G) - recommended detailed design
Appendix 19	Curlew Street (Zone G) - recommended detailed design
Appendix 20	Dockhead (Zone G) - recommended detailed design
Appendix 21	Druid Street (Zone G) - recommended detailed design
Appendix 22	Drummond Road and Clement's Road (Zone G) - recommended detailed design
Appendix 23	Kipling Street (Zone F) - recommended detailed design
Appendix 24	deleted
Appendix 25	Long Lane (Zone f) - recommended detailed design
Appendix 26	Queen Elizabeth Street (Zone G) - recommended detailed design
Appendix 27	Southwark Park Road (Zone G) - recommended detailed design

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Tim Walker	
<b>Report Author</b>	Paul Gellard (Zone F) / Michael Herd (Zone G)	
<b>Version</b>	1.0	
<b>Dated</b>	20 November 2009	
<b>Key Decision?</b>	No	
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER</b>		
<b>Officer Title</b>	<b>Comments Sought</b>	<b>Comments included</b>
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	No	No
Finance Director	No	No
Parking operations and development manager	Yes	No
Network manager	Yes	No
Parking and network management business unit manager	Yes	No
<b>Executive Member</b>	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional/Community Council/Scrutiny Team</b>	26/11/2009	