

Cabinet Member Delegated Decision 18 December 2017

Report Title: Quietway 7: Elephant and Castle to Crystal Palace

Ward(s): Thurlow Park and Gipsy Hill

Portfolio: Councillor Jennifer Brathwaite, Cabinet Member for Housing and Environment

Report authorised by: Sue Foster, Strategic Director for Neighbourhoods and Growth

Contact for enquiries: Jimmy Hall, Project Manager, Capital Programmes, Neighbourhoods & Growth, 020 7926 2583, jhall2@lambeth.gov.uk

Report Summary

This report sets out proposals relating to highway changes at nine locations within Thurlow Park and Gipsy Hill wards as part of the implementation of Quietway 7. The proposed interventions include, among other things, new zebra crossings, new parallel cycling zebra crossings, replacing speed cushions with sinusoidal humps, introducing continuous footway treatments at junctions, replacing two mini-roundabouts with priority junctions, building-out footways, new advisory cycle lanes and permitting two-way cycling on on-way streets.

The project is being delivered as part of the London Quietways programme, part of the Mayor of London's Healthy Streets agenda. It involves the introduction of a network of cycle routes and improved amenities for pedestrians throughout the capital. This report explains the reasons why the measures are being proposed and the process leading to implementation.

Finance summary

The project is funded by Transport for London as part of the Quietways programme. Quietway 7 allocation in Lambeth is £1,010,000. The cost of implementing measures proposed in this report is £1,010,000 including project management fees, development cost and contingency. Forecast expenditure on project management fees and related overheads is £37,000, of which £17,000 has been spent to date.

As the roads along the Quietway route are existing assets, future maintenance cost of the completed scheme will be funded from the highways revenue budget.

Recommendations

1. To issue scheme approval for the Quietway 7 initiatives in Thurlow Park and Gipsy Hill, as detailed in Section 2, at a cost of £1,010,000.
2. That, subject to the above approval, to agree to these schemes' implementation under section 6, 124 and Part IV of Schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended), and section 90 of the Highways Act 1980 at a cost of £1,010,000, subject to no material objections resulting from the statutory consultation process, but that any objections that are received are considered by the Cabinet Member before a decision is reached.

1 Context

- 1.1 Quietways is a network of high quality, well signed cycle routes throughout London, mostly using backstreets. The routes will link key destinations and are designed to appeal to new and existing people that cycle who want to use quieter, low-traffic routes. Quietways will complement other cycling initiatives in London, such as the Cycle Superhighways.
- 1.2 The Lambeth section of Quietway 7 route starts at the junction of Turney Road and Croxted Road, finishing at the junction of Gipsy Hill and Dulwich Wood Avenue. The majority of Quietway 7 is located in the London Borough of Southwark, running from Elephant and Castle to Turney Road with a small section at the southern end of the route between Gipsy Hill and Crystal Palace Parade. An overview of the route and a summary of the interventions can be seen in Appendix A.
- 1.3 The London Borough of Southwark approved its Quietway 7 schemes, subject to statutory consultation, detailed design and safety reviews, in November 2016. Construction is underway in Southwark and is expected to be complete in spring 2018.

2 Proposals and reasons

- 2.1 As part of the Quietway route, Lambeth Council is developing proposals to enhance facilities not only for people that cycle, but also for pedestrians and other vulnerable road users. Quietways form an essential element of the Mayor of London's Healthy Streets agenda. Improvements are being proposed along the route through investment in a range of measures including traffic calming and new pedestrian crossings, providing the route with improved safety features for all road users.
- 2.2 As stated, Lambeth Council's section of the route starts on Turney Road (junction with Croxted Road) and travels south through to Crystal Palace via Gipsy Hill. The roads that will benefit from the Quietway improvements include Turney Road, Rosendale Road, Tritton Road, Clive Road, Hamilton Road, Paxton Place, Gipsy Road and Gipsy Hill. Whilst the area is predominantly residential, it serves three schools, two places of worship, two nurseries and local shopping parades on Gipsy Road and Rosendale Road.
- 2.3 Throughout the engagement process, residents cited high traffic speeds along sections of the route as a cause of concern. This is supported by traffic surveys which were carried out between 2015 and 2017 at various locations. The results show the average 85th percentile speed (considered the speed of traffic in free-flowing traffic conditions) was above the 20mph limit along all sections of the route. All sections, aside from Clive Road, showed results considerably above the 20mph limit. The full results can be seen in Appendix B.

Location	Northbound 85 th ile mph*	Southbound 85 th ile mph*
Turney Rd (near Croxted Rd)	26.1	23.3
Rosendale Rd (near Dalkeith Rd)	29.4	28.4
Rosendale Rd (near Carson Rd)	25.0	27.6
Rosendale Rd (north of Park Hall Rd)	28.2	27.4
Rosendale Rd (south of Park Hall Rd)	29.9	28.9
Clive Rd (mid-point)	21.5	21.7
Gipsy Hill (near Charters Cl)	29.7	27.8

*The 85th percentile speed is considered the speed drivers will travel in free flowing traffic conditions

- 2.4 Accident data has been analysed over the last three years of available data (2013-2016). There have been 20 collisions resulting in an injury. These are discussed in the following table and can be found in more detail in Section 8 of this report and in Appendix C.
- 2.5 Lambeth Council will continue to monitor the road network following the changes made as part of these proposals. This will allow the Council to deal with any issues such as speeding and other road dangers.

2.6 The proposals which form the Lambeth section of Q7 are detailed in the following table:

Location, drawings & est. cost	Proposals	Reasons & benefits (reference proposals to the left)
<p>01 Turney Road</p> <p>Appendix D, p1-2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q7-D-GA-01 • Q7-D-GA-02 <p>Estimated cost £100,000</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A new footway build-out at eastern end of Turney Road 2. Replace the informal crossing and refuge with a new zebra crossing outside Turney School, extend the footway and introduce new planters, approximately 12 car parking spaces will be removed. 3. Visual narrowing of carriageway using buffer strips. 4. Replace existing speed cushions with two sinusoidal humps. 5. New cycle markings on carriageway in primary position. 6. Remove centre line. 7. Formalise parking bays and introduce new double yellow lines. 	<p>The section of Turney Road between Croxted Road and Rosendale Road requires measures to reduce the speed of vehicles and improve crossings facilities for pedestrians, especially outside the school. There have been 2 collisions reported in the last 3 years. The proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make it safer for pedestrians to cross (1,2). • Reinforce 20mph speed limit and encourage safer driver behaviour (1,2,3,4,6). • Promote cycling by introducing cycle friendly traffic calming measures (3,4,5). • Improve the streetscene and improve air quality (2). • Improve safety at junctions and safer parking practices (2,7).
<p>02 Rosendale Rd / Turney Rd</p> <p>Appendix D, p3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q7-D-GA-03 <p>Estimated cost £300,000</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove the mini-roundabout and slip road into Turney Road from Rosendale Road. 2. Build-out footways, reclaim pedestrian space and introduce new greenery. 3. Formalise the cycle bypass for route north towards Brockwell Park, textured demarcation will be used either side of the cycle lane to emphasise the cycle route. 4. Retain access to all adjacent residential driveways. 5. New parallel zebra crossings north and west of the junction. 6. Continuous footway treatment across Dalkeith Road. 7. As agreed by the Rosendale Allotment Association, maintain access to allotment site in the form of a dropped kerb and loading bay. 8. Double yellow lines across driveways outside 241-245 Rosendale Road. 9. Sinusoidal hump on Rosendale Road to Brockwell Park. 	<p>The junction of Rosendale Road, Dalkeith Road and Turney Road is currently a mini-roundabout. The wide carriageway and slip road encourage high vehicle speeds and make it challenging for pedestrians to cross. The proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make a safer walking environment and reinforce pedestrian priority at informal crossings (2,6). • Make it safer for pedestrians to cross, particularly for children travelling to and from school and to access the playing fields on Rosendale Road (5,6). • Reinforce 20mph speed limit and encourage safer driver behaviour (1,5,9). • Promote cycling by introducing cycle friendly measures (3,5). • Improve the streetscene and improve air quality (2). • Improve safety at junctions and safer parking/loading practices (1,2,4,6,7,8).

Location, drawings & est. cost	Proposals	Reasons & benefits (reference proposals to the left)
<p>03 Rosendale Rd to Thurlow Park Rd</p> <p>Appendix D, p4-6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q7-D-GA-04 • Q7-D-GA-05 • Q7-D-GA-06 <p>Estimated cost £50,000</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Replace the informal crossing with a speed table and cycle bypass around an island where southbound vehicles have priority over northbound vehicles. 2. Replace the informal crossing with a new zebra crossing outside All Saints Church on a raised table, this will result in the net loss of approximately three parking bays. 3. Replace existing of speed cushions with five sinusoidal speed humps. 4. Introduce 1.5m advisory cycle lanes. 5. Remove the centre line. 6. Raised entry treatments at the two junctions with Lovelace Road. 7. Formalise parking bays and introduce new double yellow lines. 	<p>The section of Rosendale Road to Thurlow Park road requires measures to reduce the speed of traffic and provide better crossing facilities for pedestrians. There has been 1 collision reported in the last 3 years. The proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinforce 20mph speed limit and encourage safer driver behaviour (1,2,3,5,6). • Promote cycling by introducing cycle friendly measures (1,3,4). • Make it safer for pedestrians to cross (2). • Improve safety at junctions and safer parking practices (7).
<p>04 Rosendale Rd/Thurlow Park Rd (TfL scheme)</p> <p>Appendix D, p7</p> <p>Constructed by TfL.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Two-stage right turn for cyclists. 2. Pedestrian crossings realigned and widened to 3.2m. 3. New mandatory cycle lanes at least 1.5m. 4. Low-level signals with an early-release for cyclists on the Quietway. 5. Carriageway and footway resurfacing. 	<p>This is a TfL scheme and detail is provided for information only. The speed and volume of traffic using this junction make it challenging to turn right and the crossing points are not aligned with pedestrian desire lines. There have been 3 collisions reported in the last 3 years. The proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote cycling by introducing cycle friendly measures (1,3,4). • Make it safer for pedestrians to cross (2).
<p>05 Rosendale Road Shops (Thurlow Park Rd to Park Hall Rd)</p> <p>Appendix D, p8-10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q7-D-GA-07 • Q7-D-GA-08 • Q7-D-GA-09 <p>Estimated cost £383,000 (for both 05 & 06)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove existing informal crossings and islands, and install a zebra on a raised table with build-outs. 2. Formalise parking bays, there is no net loss in parking bays. 3. Replace existing speed cushions with six sinusoidal road humps. 4. Introduce 1.5m advisory cycle lanes. 5. Continuous footway treatments and build-outs at junctions with Carson Road, Eastmearn Road, Elmworth Grove and Idmiston Road. 6. Remove the centre line. 	<p>The section of Rosendale Road from Thurlow Park Road to Park Hall Road has high vehicle speeds and lacks pedestrian crossing facilities, both across Rosendale Road and the side roads. There have been 7 collisions reported in the last 3 years. The proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinforce 20mph speed limit and encourage safer driver behaviour (1,3,5,6). • Provide safer pedestrian crossings (1,5). • Improve safety at junctions and safer parking practice (2,5). • Promote cycling by introducing cycle friendly measures (3,4).

Location, drawings & est. cost	Proposals	Reasons & benefits (reference proposals to the left)
<p>06 Rosendale Rd / Park Hall Rd to Myton Rd</p> <p>Appendix D, p11-12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q7-D-GA-10 • Q7-D-GA-11 <p>Estimated cost £383,000 (for both 05 & 06)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Replacing the mini-roundabout with a priority (north-south) junction on a raised table. 2. A new zebra on the southern arm and three informal, at grade, crossings. 3. Build-out pavements. 4. New trees. 5. Provide 1.5m advisory cycle lanes either side of junction. 6. Remove the centre line. 7. Create a raised table and improve crossing at Myton Road. 8. Replace existing speed cushions with one new sinusoidal hump. 	<p>The junction of Rosendale Road and Park Hall Road is currently a mini-roundabout. The wide carriageway encourages high vehicle speeds and makes it challenging for pedestrians to cross. In the last three years there have been three collisions reported. There is a significant left-turn movement from Rosendale Road (north) to Park Hall Road (east) which creates a significant risk of a left-hook movement for cyclists travelling southbound. At the request of local councillors, traffic modelling has been carried out which suggests there will be no significant impact on queuing times. The proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinforce 20mph speed limit and encourage safer driver behaviour (1,3,6,7,8). • Provide safer pedestrian crossings (2,7). • Improve the streetscene and improve air quality (4). • Promote cycling by introducing cycle friendly measures (1,5,8). • Make a safer walking environment and reinforce pedestrian priority at informal crossings (2,3,7).
<p>07 Rosendale Rd to Tritton Rd</p> <p>Appendix D, p13-15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q7-D-GA-12 • Q7-D-GA-13 • Q7-D-GA-14 <p>Estimated cost £50,000</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Change the priority of junction and place on a raised table. 2. Build-out the footway to tighten corners and add new trees. 3. Install a new zebra outside the entrance to the school. 4. Widen the footway outside Elm Wood Primary School. 5. Replace existing speed cushions with two new sinusoidal humps. 	<p>The southern section of Rosendale Road to the junction with Tritton Road requires measures to reduce the speed of vehicles, improve the crossing facilities for schoolchildren and provide better visibility at the junction. The proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinforce 20mph speed limit and encourage safer driver behaviour (1,2,3,4,5). • Improve the streetscene and improve air quality (2). • Provide safer pedestrian crossings (3). • Make a safer walking environment (2,3,4). • Promote cycling by introducing cycle friendly measures (5).
<p>08 Clive Rd to Hamilton Rd</p> <p>Appendix D, p16-18</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q7-D-GA-15 • Q7-D-GA-16 <p>Estimated cost £62,000</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Change the priority of junction. 2. Widen the footways and raise the road surface. 3. Formalise on-street provision by marking bays but retain part-footway parking. 	<p>The junction between Clive Road and Hamilton Road requires measures to reduce traffic speed through the junction and when turning to and from Hamilton Road /Clive Road. The proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinforce 20mph speed limit (1,2). • Promote cycling by introducing cycle friendly measures (1). • Make a safer walking environment (1). • Improve safety at junctions and safer parking practices (1,3).

Location, drawings & est. cost	Proposals	Reasons & benefits (reference proposals to the left)
<p>09 Paxton Place / Gipsy Rd / Gipsy Hill</p> <p>Appendix D, p19-20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q7-D-GA-17 • Q7-D-GA-18 <p>Estimated cost £55,000</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Permit two-way cycling in Paxton Place. 2. New parallel pedestrian/cycle zebra crossing at the north of Gipsy Hill. 3. Upgrade the existing zebra crossing to a parallel cycle zebra crossing on Gipsy Road. 4. New shared-use area with advisory cycle track. 5. Continuous footway across the entrance to Paxton Place. 	<p>Cycling southbound is not currently permitted on Paxton Place. There is high pedestrian footfall in the area and crossing Gipsy Road and Gipsy Hill is challenging for cyclists due to high traffic volumes. Crossing the northern end of Gipsy Hill is a pedestrian desire line, which is catered for by a pedestrian refuge. 1 collision has been reported in the last 3 years. The proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote cycling by introducing cycle friendly measures (1,2,3,4). • Provide safer pedestrian crossings (2,5). • Make a safer walking environment and reinforce pedestrian priority at informal crossings (2,5).
<p>10 Gipsy Hill to Dulwich Wood Avenue</p> <p>Appendix D, p21-24</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q7-D-GA-19 <p>Estimated cost £10,000</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduce a new 2m advisory cycle lane southbound (uphill) between Oaks Avenue and Dulwich Wood Avenue. 2. Introduce double yellow lines on the western (downhill) side of Gipsy Hill. 3. Formalise parking by marking bays on the eastern (uphill) side of Gipsy Hill. 4. Replace existing speed cushions with three new sinusoidal humps. 	<p>The section of Gipsy Hill between Gipsy Road and Dulwich Wood Avenue would benefit from traffic calming to reduce vehicle speeds. 6 collisions have been reported in the last 3 years. The proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinforce 20mph speed limit (4). • Promote cycling by introducing cycle friendly measures (1,4). • Improve safety at junctions and safer parking practices (2,3).

3 Finance

- 3.1 The project is funded by Transport for London as part of the Quietways delivery programme. The design, informal consultation and statutory consultation costs are met separately by Transport for London via their delivery agent for Quietways, Sustrans. The cost of implementing measures proposed in this report is £1,010,000 including project management fees, development cost and contingency. Forecast expenditure on project management fees and related overheads is £37,000, of which £17,000 has been spent to date.
- 3.2 The cost of the measures proposed in this report includes all Lambeth Council's costs including project management, construction and contingency.
- 3.3 Estimated costs are detailed in the table below:

Scheme	Estimate
01 Croxted Road / Turney Road)	£100,000
02 Rosendale Road / Turney Road / Dalkeith Road junction	£300,000
03 Rosendale Road / Lovelace Road	£50,000
04 Rosendale Road / Thurlow Park Road junction	N/A
05 Rosendale Road Shops	£383,000
06 Park Hall Road Junction	
07 Rosendale Road / Tritton Road / Clive Road junction	£50,000
08 Clive Road / Hamilton Road junction	£62,000
09 Paxton Place / Gipsy Road	£10,000
10 Gipsy Road / Gipsy Hill	£55,000
TOTAL	£1,010,000

- 3.4 As the roads along the Quietway route are existing assets, future maintenance cost of the completed scheme will be funded from the highways revenue budget.

4 Legal and Democracy

- 4.1 The Council's powers to implement the measures proposed in this report are principally set out in the Highways Act 1980 (HA80) and Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA) and will require the making of Traffic Management Orders (TMO).
- 4.2 In making such Orders, the Council must follow the statutory consultation procedures set out in the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (the 1996 Regulations). The said Regulations, prescribe inter alia, specific publication, consultation and notification requirements that must be strictly observed. It is incumbent on the Council to take account of any representations made during the consultation stage and any material objections received to the making of the Order, must be reported back to the decision maker before the Order is made.
- 4.3 By virtue of section 122 of the RTRA, 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. 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

4.4 A recent High Court judgment confirms that the Council must have proper regard to the matters set out in section 122(1) and (2) and specifically document its analysis of all relevant section 122 considerations when reaching any decision.

4.5 Changes to parking, waiting and loading arrangements and restrictions

Sections 6, 124 and Part IV of Schedule 9 of the RTRA, enable the Council to implement, by Order (TMO), the proposed parking, waiting and loading arrangements in the road to which this report refers. The same also provides the Council with the power to prescribe streets which are not to be used for traffic (of all kinds or some specified description(s)) and routes to be followed by all classes of traffic (or as otherwise specified). Section 6 of the RTRA provides that the Council may make a TMO for any of the following purposes (mentioned at paragraphs (a) to (g) of section 1(1) of the Act) namely:

- a) for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, or
- b) for preventing damage to the road or to any building on or near the road, or
- c) for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians), or
- d) for preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property, or
- e) (without prejudice to the generality of paragraph (d) above) for preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot, or
- f) for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs
- g) for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of section 87 of the Environment Act 1995 (air quality).

4.6 Traffic Calming

Traffic calming works in London are prescribed within the provisions of sections 90G – 90I of the Highways Act 1980 and the Highways (Traffic Calming) Regulations 1999 (as amended). Where a highway authority proposes to construct a traffic calming work in a highway they shall –

- a) consult the police for the area in which the highway is situated, and
- b) consult such persons or organisations representing persons who use the highway or are otherwise likely to be affected by the traffic calming works as the highway authority thinks fit.

4.7 Speed Humps

The power to construct (and remove) speed humps is provided by section 90A of the Highways Act 1980. The exercise of these powers is subject to compliance with the notification, consultation and design requirements of the Highways (Road Humps) Regulations 1999 as amended. The consultation requirements are set out at Section 90C of the HA80 and detailed in the said Regulations. Those requirements include a duty to consult with:

- the chief police officer;
- the fire and rescue authority;

- the chief officer of any body providing ambulance services; and
 - organisations appearing to represent persons who use the highway to which the proposal relates, or to represent persons who are otherwise likely to be affected by the road hump.
- 4.8 The relevant signage requirements are set out at Regulation 6 of the said Regulations and the required sign or signs specified in the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 (TSRGD). The Council has, pursuant to Section 62 of the Highways Act 1980, a general power to improve any highway in its area. Section 75 of the Highways Act 1980 extends a power to vary the relative widths of the carriageway and of any footway.
- 4.9 Pedestrian Crossings
Section 23 of the RTRA provides powers to establish, alter and remove crossing for pedestrians and requires that such crossings be indicated in the manner prescribed by regulations made under Section 25 of that Act. The relevant Regulations for this purpose is the TSRGD.
- 4.10 Section 23(2) of the RTRA provides that before establishing a crossing the local authority shall:
- Consult with the chief officer of the police about their proposal to do so; and
 - Shall give public notice of that proposal to do so.
- 4.11 Once the abovementioned Order/traffic calming measures are in place, the council is required to make the necessary amendments to the road markings and signage as soon as practicable to adequately provide information as to the Order/traffic calming measures that are in place in the area.
- 4.12 The history and outcome of non-statutory stakeholder consultation undertaken to date is detailed at Section 5 of this report and explained in full detail in Appendices E to J. The following principles of consultation were set out in a recent High Court case: First, a consultation had to be at a time when proposals were still at a formative stage. Second, the proposer had to give accurate and sufficient reasons for any proposal to permit of intelligent consideration and meaningful response. Third, adequate time had to be given for consideration and response, and finally, the product of consultation had to be considered with a receptive mind and conscientiously taken into account in finalising any statutory proposals. The process of consultation had to be effective and looked at as a whole it had to be fair. Fairness might require consultation not only upon the preferred option, but also upon discarded options. The proposals detailed in this report require the making of a TMO The statutory procedure to be followed in this connection is detailed above and includes a statutory consultation stage. The Council is obliged to take account of any representations made at that stage and any material objections received will need to be reported back to the decision maker before an Order is made. All representations received must be properly considered in the light of administrative law principles, Human Rights law and the relevant statutory principles. The 1996 Regulations provides for the holding of a public inquiry in connection with a decision to approve, modify or abandon a TMO. The purpose of such an inquiry would be for the proposal to be examined and for the public to be given the opportunity to make their views known in a public forum. The Council is only obliged to hold a public inquiry if the proposal relates to the prohibition of loading and unloading of vehicles of any class in a road on any day of the week (i) at all times, (ii) before 0700, (iii) between 1000 and 1600 hours, or (iv) after 1900 hours and an objection has been made to the proposed order; or the order relates to the prohibition or restriction of passage of public service vehicles. In all other cases, the decision maker may determine at his discretion whether or not to hold a public inquiry before making an order.

- 4.13 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 sets out the new public sector equality duty replacing the previous duties in relation to race, sex and disability and extending the duty to all the protected characteristics i.e. race, sex, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion or belief, pregnancy or maternity, marriage or civil partnership and gender reassignment. The public sector equality duty requires public authorities to have due regard to the need to:
- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation
 - Advance equality of opportunity and
 - Foster good relations between those who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- 4.14 Part of the duty to have “due regard” where there is disproportionate impact will be to take steps to mitigate the impact and the Council must demonstrate that this has been done, and/or justify the decision, on the basis that it is a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim. Accordingly, there is an expectation that a decision maker will explore other means which have less of a disproportionate impact.
- 4.15 The Equality Duty must be complied with before and at the time that a particular policy is under consideration or decision is taken – that is, in the development of policy options, and in making a final decision. A public body cannot satisfy the Equality Duty by justifying a decision after it has been taken.
- 4.16 In addition to the above, Section 175A of the Highways Act 1980 extends a specific duty upon local authorities to have regard to the needs of the disabled and the blind in the execution of certain street works (namely the placing of lamp-posts, bollards, traffic signs, apparatus or other permanent obstructions) which may impede such persons.
- 4.17 The Council’s constitution delegates to Directors and Assistant Directors the authority to consider objections received from statutory consultation as part of the Traffic Order making process, subject to a formal report setting out the objections, with clear recommendations, being submitted for approval and the power to make, amend or revoke traffic orders, following the consideration of such objections.
- 4.18 This proposed key decision was entered in the Forward Plan on 15 September 2017 and the necessary 28 clear days’ notice has been given. In addition, the Council’s Constitution requires the report to be published on the website for five clear days before the proposed decision is approved by the Cabinet Member. Any representations received during this period must be considered by the decision-maker before the decision is taken. A further period of five clear days - the call-in period – must then elapse before the decision is enacted. If the decision is called-in during this period, it cannot be enacted until the call-in has been considered and resolved.

5 Consultation and co-production

5.1 Route selection

In March 2014, seven pilot Quietway routes were selected based on the following criteria: directness and cohesion; attractiveness; traffic composition and impact on other users; buildability; political support; network prioritisation and phasing. Quietway 7 is one of these pilot routes and the specific alignment was chosen by the Cycling Commissioner and Transport for London.

5.2 Early engagement (Summer 2015)

From August 2015 until January 2016 Sustrans (on behalf of the Council) ran an engagement process around Rosendale Road in relation to Quietway 7. A mail-out was sent to 4,000 addresses. Eight information sessions and co-design workshops were run between 19 September 2015 and 9 December 2015. Approximately 600 people were engaged with as part of the events. Two on-line surveys were carried out (the first to gather issues and concerns, the second to review proposals). The results of the surveys were used to inform the design proposals prior to the next stage of consultation. Full details are in Appendix E.

5.3 Informal consultation (Early 2016)

5.3.1 Following the early engagement, the council consulted on concept proposals with the support of Transport for London. The consultation ran between 10 February and 20 March 2016. It was split into two areas (West Dulwich and Gipsy Hill) and was listed on the Lambeth website.

5.3.2 The consultation also publicised via letter drop to the public (4207 households in West Dulwich and 2185 in Gipsy Hill) and email to stakeholder groups and individuals (298 recipients). Materials included an overview letter, a detailed drawing of the proposals and a route map of Quietway 7 showing the consultations and schemes in context. The public were invited to respond via an online survey on the TfL website, by letter, and by email.

5.3.3 The West Dulwich area received 266 responses, a response rate of 6%. The Gipsy Hill area received 71 responses, a response rate of 3%. In both consultations respondents could comment on multiple proposals. The results of the responses to specific questions about the proposals are summarised in the table below:

Location	Responses	Response Rate	Support / partially support		Did not support		Unsure		No opinion	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
West Dulwich Area (4207 households + 298 stakeholder groups)										
01/02 Turney Road*	149	3%	61	41%	68	46%	4	3%	16	11%
03 Lovelace Rd/Rosendale Rd	127	3%	50	39%	58	46%	6	5%	13	10%
04 Thurlow Park Road (TfL Scheme)	136	3%	53	39%	69	51%	9	7%	5	4%
05 Rosendale Road Shops	131	3%	63	48%	57	44%	6	5%	5	4%
06 Park Hall Rd/Rosendale Rd	125	3%	50	40%	64	51%	3	2%	8	6%
07 Tritton Rd/Rosendale Rd	115	3%	37	32%	44	38%	8	7%	26	23%
Gipsy Hill Area (2185 households + 298 stakeholder groups) -										
08 Clive Rd/Hamilton Rd	51	2%	18	35%	29	57%	3	6%	1	2%
09 Paxton Place/Gipsy Rd	59	2%	17	29%	38	64%	4	7%	0	0%
10 Gipsy Hill	60	2%	15	25%	42	70%	2	3%	1	2%
* Current interventions 01 and 02 were combined as 01 in the 2016 consultation										

5.3.4 The concept proposals along the Quietway route received mixed support from respondents to the consultation. As a result, the council responded to a number of the key issues and the scheme was altered to address concerns where possible. The table in Section 5.4 explains the changes made following consultation. For more information about the details of the consultation carried out in early 2016, please see:

- Appendix F – West Dulwich area consultation report
- Appendix G – Rosendale Rd/Thurlow Park Rd junction consultation report
- Appendix H – Gipsy Hill area consultation report

5.4 Further Informal consultation (Aug 2017 to Nov 2017)

- 5.4.1 In June 2017, a decision was made to proceed with the Quietway scheme. However, due to concerns raised by local Councillors, this decision was withdrawn. Officers and Councillors planned additional engagement and consultation so all residents had the opportunity to review plans and provide feedback on the proposals.
- 5.4.2 From August until November 2017 the Council ran an engagement process across the Lambeth sections of Quietway 7. Officers and ward councillors met with stakeholder groups and public information sessions were run in Gipsy Hill and Thurlow Park wards, the events were publicised through local ward Councillors and residents groups. The events were well attended with around 50 people attending each event. The designers incorporated the comments into the design where possible and responded to the comments from stakeholders and residents. These have been summarised in Appendix I.
- 5.4.3 On 10 October 2017 the council website was updated with the full proposed plans, responses to the previous consultation and design justification.
- 5.4.4 From 10 October to 5 November 2017 the council invited comments from local residents and stakeholders. Everyone who left a contacting address in the 2016 consultation was sent an email or letter informing them of the opportunity to review and comment on the latest designs.
- 5.4.5 Over the course of the consultation, in addition to the comments received at the consultation sessions, 29 responses were received (16 via the webform, 5 via email, 4 by post and 4 forwarded by Councillors). These comments, in addition to ones received previously in the consultation have been used to inform the current design. The changes made to current scheme, as a result of the consultation exercises, are explained in the table below.

5.5 Responses to the consultation and changes made to the design proposals

Location & drawings	Main concerns raised	Changes to design / response to concerns
<p>01 Turney Road</p> <p>Appendix D, p1-2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q7-D-GA-01 • Q7-D-GA-02 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in car parking • The traffic volumes are too high • The traffic speeds are too fast 	<p>Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed car parking removal of all spaces (around 29) on the northern side of Turney Road was dropped, approximately 12 car parking spaces will still need to be removed to accommodate a new zebra crossing outside the school. <p>Other responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes to the capacity of the road network is planned, however, the route should be less attractive to non-residents using Rosendale Road as a short-cut. • Existing speed cushions are being replaced with sinusoidal road humps. These will reduce traffic speeds more effectively. The proposed layout creates a visual narrowing and traffic calming effect by introducing a buffer strip directly adjacent to the parking spaces on either side of the carriageway.
<p>02 Rosendale Rd / Turney Rd</p> <p>Appendix D, p3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q7-D-GA-03 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to the allotments • Location of crossings/shared space • Urban realm concerns 	<p>Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An 11m loading bay has been added to the proposals to give better access to the allotments, the layout of the street furniture has been altered to ensure the allotment can receive deliveries. • The cycle path will have textured demarcation to aid way-finding and reduce speeds. • A workshop is planned to allow residents to feed in to additional public realm proposals. <p>Other responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The locations of the crossings were determined as a result of iterative design and scrutinised at Stage 1 and Stage 2 Road Safety Audit, the recommendations of which were incorporated in to the current design.
<p>03 Rosendale Rd to Thurlow Park Rd</p> <p>Appendix D, p4-6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q7-D-GA-04 • Q7-D-GA-05 • Q7-D-GA-06 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positioning of new zebra crossing • Cars encroaching on advisory cycle lanes • Reduction in car parking 	<p>Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor alteration to extents of double yellow lines to prevent car parking adjacent to the entrance of Walkerscroft Mead. <p>Other responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new zebra crossing formalises the existing crossing outside All Saints Church. • Quietways are designed in accordance with the London Cycle Design Standards (LCDS) and advisory lanes are recommended where carriageway widths are insufficient to implement mandatory or separated lanes. Options for fully segregated, light segregated and two-way tracks were investigated, however, the layout of the road was not conducive to these due to uncontrolled parking, private driveways and existing mature trees. • The current proposals minimise the loss of parking to residents. Where new double yellow lines are proposed this is to promote safety, parking on or close to a junction poses a hazard to all road users. The Highway Code stipulates that motorists should not park within 10 metres of a junction unless it is an authorised parking space (Rule 243).

Location & drawings	Main concerns raised	Changes to design / response to concerns
<p>04 Rosendale Rd/Thurlow Park Rd (TfL scheme)</p> <p>Appendix D, p7</p> <p>Designed, approved and constructed by TfL.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on traffic • Two-stage right turns • Increased congestion 	<p>No changes.</p> <p>Having considered all responses and reviewed their proposals, TfL are satisfied their proposal “provides a safer and more convenient options for cyclists and pedestrians using the Thurlow Park Road section of Rosendale Road” (see Appendix G for the response to the consultation).</p>
<p>05 Rosendale Road Shops (Thurlow Park Rd to Park Hall Rd)</p> <p>Appendix D, p8-10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q7-D-GA-07 • Q7-D-GA-08 • Q7-D-GA-09 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in car parking • Location of zebra crossing • Cars encroaching into advisory cycle lanes • Access to Elmworth Grove • Rat-running on side streets 	<p>Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location of zebra crossing has been altered to result in no net loss of safe parking in the area. The 24m (4-5 spaces) removed from outside the shops has been relocated in the immediate area by reducing the amount of double yellow lines, narrowing build-outs and removing the two informal crossings. <p>Other responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The position of the new zebra crossing has been determined as a result of iterative design and scrutinised at Stage 1 and Stage 2 Road Safety Audit, from which recommendations were incorporated. It is located in the centre of the row of businesses and provides a safer way for people to cross Rosendale Road than currently exists. In addition, the zebra will be on a raised table and forms part of a series of traffic calming measures along Rosendale Road. • Quietways are designed in accordance with the London Cycle Design Standards (LCDS) and advisory lanes are recommended where carriageway widths are insufficient to implement mandatory or separated lanes. Options for fully segregated, light segregated, two-way tracks were investigated, however, the layout of the road was not conducive to this due to parking, private driveways and mature trees. • Access to Elmworth Grove will not be affected, residents and service vehicles can continue to use the entrances as they do currently. • To deter rat-running and excessive speeding on the streets running from Rosendale Road we have narrowed the width of the side roads approaching the junction and proposed blended footway treatments at the junctions. This will reduce the speed of turning movements and provide a much easier crossing for pedestrians on a continuous footway. • Additional traffic calming further from the Quietway route is out of scope for this project, but subject to consultation and funding the 2018/19 Our Streets programme for Thurlow Park could explore measures to reduce rat running and speeding on Dalmore Road in response to concerns raised that the Quietway does not cover side streets.

Location & drawings	Main concerns raised	Changes to design / response to concerns
<p>06 Rosendale Rd / Park Hall Rd to Myton Rd</p> <p>Appendix D, p11-12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q7-D-GA-10 • Q7-D-GA-11 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to removal of the roundabout • Positioning of zebra crossing • Loss of pedestrian refuges 	<p>The current proposal is to remove the mini-roundabout and replace it with a priority junction, with the priority being given to Rosendale Road over Park Hall Road.</p> <p>To reduce traffic speeds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The junction is to be placed on a raised table. • The corners of the junction are to be tightened to require vehicles to slow to take the corner. • The road width is narrowed by building-out the pavements on each arm. <p>To improve pedestrian safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new zebra crossing is located on the southern arm – various locations have been suggested during design, the southern arm has been chosen as it will create breaks in traffic flow to allow vehicles to exit from Park Hall Road and turn right into Rosendale Road, additionally there is already a new zebra crossing proposed 175m to the north, adjacent to Rosendale Road shops. • Although the refuges are proposed to be removed, the overall crossing distance is reduced to 8m (from 11m) across Rosendale Road and to 6m (from 8m on the western arm and 10m on the eastern arm) across Park Hall Road. • Each crossing point will be flush with the pavement. • The informal crossing points are better aligned with the pedestrian desire line. <p>To improve cyclist safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of mini-roundabout: mini-roundabouts raise the failure of vehicles to observe the give way due to the geometry and fail to reduce speed through the junction. • Installation of priority junction to support the north-south movement. • Narrowed lanes prevent overtaking and reduce the risk of a left-hook from vehicles. • Clearly marked cycle symbols raise drivers' awareness of the presence of cyclists. • Raised table reduces the speed on entry and exit of the junction. <p>The proposed junction layout has undergone traffic modelling with the outcome that “it is reasonable to conclude that there is unlikely to be a material increase in queuing on this [Park Hall Road east] arm” – please see Appendix I, p17.</p> <p>Overall the proposal offers a significant improvement for road safety, the proposals are expected to result in a reduction in vehicle speed through the junction and a better level of service for vulnerable road users including pedestrians and cyclists without significantly diminishing the capacity of the junction.</p>

Location & drawings	Main concerns raised	Changes to design / response to concerns
<p>07 Rosendale Rd to Tritton Rd</p> <p>Appendix D, p13-15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q7-D-GA-12 • Q7-D-GA-13 • Q7-D-GA-14 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in car parking • Alignment not giving Quietway priority • Displacement of traffic 	<p>Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new zebra crossing was included opposite the entrance to Elm Wood Primary School. <p>Other responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At other junctions along the route, priority for the Quietway is preferred, however in this location, to mitigate against collision risks for right turning vehicles from Rosendale Road to Tritton Road westbound, priority is given to west/north movements. • The design proposes a small loss of car parking, 16m or 3 parking spaces. The removal of parking is required to treat the entry/exit points to reduce traffic speeds, improve visibility and make it a safer environment for all. • The main area of parking loss will be on Tritton Road outside the school where the 'Keep Clear – School' markings will be replaced with a build-out and extended double yellow lines. • There are no proposals to reduce the vehicle capacity. It is not anticipated there will be a significant increase in congestion as a result of this scheme.
<p>08 Clive Rd to Hamilton Rd</p> <p>Appendix D, p16-18</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q7-D-GA-15 • Q7-D-GA-16 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority change • High traffic volumes • High vehicle speeds 	<p>Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two-way cycling proposal on Berry Lane was removed. <p>Other responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In accordance with to the London Cycling Design Standards cycle lanes and tracks should aim to have priority over turning traffic. This is important not just for directness and continuity, but also safety. A high proportion of collisions involving cyclists arise from motor vehicles turning across cyclists, either through failing to see a cyclist or failing to observe good practice on road user behaviour and priority as set out in the Highway Code (Rule 183). • In early 2017, traffic surveys were carried out along Hamilton Road. The average volume of vehicles per day was 630 eastbound and 848 westbound. This is within the limit recommended by TfL of less than 3,000 per day for a Quietway. • To reduce traffic speeds we are proposing to change to the road layout through road narrowing, horizontal deflection (build-outs) and by introducing a raised table at the new junction on Hamilton Road.
<p>09 Paxton Place / Gipsy Rd / Gipsy Hill</p> <p>Appendix D, p19-20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q7-D-GA-17 • Q7-D-GA-18 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two-way cycling on Paxton Place • Pedestrian/cycle conflict in proposed shared space • Conflict between cyclists and vehicles 	<p>Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Added additional provision to slow cyclists, improve visibility and promote pedestrian priority by increased demarcation of cycle lanes. • Removed additional street clutter. • Congestion at the junction justified' keep clear' markings. <p>Other responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2-way cycling in Paxton Place offers a suitable alternative route for new or less confident cyclists to using Hamilton Road and Gipsy Road.

Location & drawings	Main concerns raised	Changes to design / response to concerns
<p>10 Gipsy Hill to Dulwich Wood Avenue</p> <p>Appendix D, p21-24</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Q7-D-GA-19 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns over the route alignment Reduction in car parking and location of restrictions High traffic flows/speeds 	<p>Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In light of the consultation responses the position of parking restrictions has been relocated to the opposite side of the road. <p>Other responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are working with Southwark and Transport for London to explore the feasibility of linking between the northern sections of Gipsy Hill and Dulwich Wood Avenue without reducing the level of service for pedestrian at the bus stop on the southern side of the roundabout.

6 Risk management

		Impact			
		Minor (1)	Significant (2)	Serious (4)	Major (8)
Likelihood	Very likely (4)	4	8	16	32
	Likely (3)	3	6	12	24
	Unlikely (2)	2	4	8	16
	Very Unlikely (1)	1	2	4	8

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Score	Mitigation
There is a risk the programme will not be delivered in conjunction with the rest of the Quietway 7 route in Southwark.	3	2	6	Construction timescales have been communicated with TfL and the Quietway is being constructed from north to south to facilitate sections opening as they are ready from central London outwards.
There is a risk that the decision will be called-in which could delay the programme.	2	2	4	The call-in and scrutiny process has been factored in to a version of the programme.
There is a financial risk the cost of the schemes could increase as the designs are sent to the contractor.	2	2	4	Sustrans have estimated the costs using bills of quantities and CVU rates throughout the design process. A contingency has been built into the current estimates to manage this risk.
There is a risk the change request for the delay in programme will not be signed-off by the Quietways board.	1	4	4	The changes to the programme have been communicated with TfL and the Council has met with the Cycling Commissioner. TfL are comfortable with the revised programme and are very likely to sign-off the programme following the decision to proceed with the scheme.
There is a risk the CVU will not have sufficient resource to deliver the project.	2	2	4	CVU are already engaged and an indicative programme has been discussed. Construction will be phased in three sections to maximise use of resources.
There is a risk that objections will be raised at statutory consultation which could change the quality of the project.	3	1	3	Stakeholders and residents have been engaged in the design process. Further changes following statutory consultation are not uncommon for a scheme of this type but it is unlikely any new concerns will be raised. Changes should be minimal and can be addressed following a consultation report to the cabinet member.
There is a risk the schemes will not be co-ordinated with other projects across Lambeth causing reputational damage and additional disruption to residents.	1	2	2	Programme is considered in conjunction with other major schemes such as HIP and tree planting.

7 Equalities impact assessment

- 7.1 The project manager has screened the scheme's likely effect on people who have one or more of the protected characteristics (race, sex, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion or belief, pregnancy or maternity, marriage or civil partnership and gender reassignment). The screening looked at how the scheme might:
- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation,
 - Advance equality of opportunity, and
 - Foster good relations between those who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- 7.2 Only one of the protected characteristics, disability, was identified as being disproportionately affected by the scheme. Part of the duty to have "due regard" where there is disproportionate impact will be to take steps to mitigate the impact and the Council must demonstrate that this has been done, and/or justify the decision, on the basis that it is a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim. Accordingly, there is an expectation that a decision maker will explore other means which have less of a disproportionate impact.
- 7.3 By following best practice (e.g. Manual for Streets 2), de-cluttering the footways combined with making footways flush with the carriageway to provide a net benefit for pedestrians with restricted mobility.
- 7.4 However, the loss of a discernible difference in level between the footway and carriageway at several locations may mean that people with a visual impairment could suffer a net disbenefit from the scheme. Whilst the RNIB have a standing objection to such a change, the tactile paving that would be introduced at the entry points to the affected length means that the risk arising from this is mitigated to the degree recommended in the DfT's best practice manual, "Guidance on the Use of Tactile Paving Surfaces".
- 7.5 The ability for Blue Badge holders to park convenient to their chosen destination is not forecast to be materially affected by this scheme. In addition, at the junction of Turney Road and Rosendale Road, the proposals include a dedicated loading bay for the allotments, which will have removable bollards managed by the Rosendale Allotment Association. It is expected this will be used to provide dedicated and reserved parking for allotment users with a disability.
- 7.6 White and male Londoners are more likely to cycle than women or those from ethnic minority groups. By creating safer and more attractive streets to cycle, the proposals in this report aim to make cycling a more inclusive mode of transport and hope to encourage an increased number of BME and female cyclists.
- 7.7 The measures in the report will create a better street environment for young, elderly and disabled pedestrians. Additional zebra crossings and reduced road widths make roads easier to cross and the additional traffic calming measures and greening will reduce traffic speed and make the environment safer, improving the amenity of the route.

8 Community safety

8.1 The project should improve the condition of safety on the public highway which is likely to reduce the risk of serious collisions in the future.

8.2 In the last three years of available data (from 2014-16) there have been:

- 20 collisions resulting in injury
- 18 resulting in slight injury, 2 in serious injury
- Cyclists injured – 8 (incl. 1 seriously)
- Powered two-wheelers riders injured – 3 (incl. 1 seriously)
- Pedestrians injured – 0
- Children injured – 1
- Collisions occurring in dark – 9
- Collisions occurring in wet – 3

8.3 More detail is available in Appendix C, Quietway 7 – Collision Overview.

9 Organisational implications

9.1 Environmental

Contractors are required to carry out works in adherence to Lambeth Council's Sustainable Construction Policy.

9.1.1 These proposals compliment the Mayor of London's draft Transport and Environment Strategies by improving the public realm to encourage walking and cycling. Modal shift to more walking and cycling benefits local air quality and helps to reduce the borough's carbon emissions. The new trees and planters across the scheme also contribute towards the Lambeth 2017-2022 Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP- Action Point 32) by increasing green infrastructure. The proposals also compliment Action Point 41.1 to increase the amount of citizens cycling outside the 18-38 age group.

9.2 Staffing and accommodation

A staffing resource amounting to 0.5FTE has been allocated in the Service Plan to deliver this project; this resource is already in post.

9.3 Procurement

The LoHAC framework will be called on to construct these schemes.

9.4 Health

None as a result of his report.

10 Timetable for implementation

Description	Date
Scheme Approval	Dec 2017
Traffic Orders/Notices	Jan 2018
Scheme Construction	March 2018
Construction Complete	October 2018

Measurable aims and outcomes:

- Improved road safety
- Improved environment for residents and for walking and cycling
- Increase in the number of journey stages made by cycling
- Increase in the number of journey stages made by walking

Audit Trail				
Consultation				
Name/Position	Lambeth directorate / department or partner	Date Sent	Date Received	Comments in paragraph:
Cllr Jennifer Brathwaite	Cabinet Member for Housing and Environment, Gipsy Hill ward	24.11.17	5.12.17	2, 5, 7
Cllr Luke Murphy	Gipsy Hill ward	29.11.17	4.12.17	5
Cllr Matthew Bennett	Gipsy Hill ward	29.11.17	-	-
Cllr Anna Birley	Thurlow Park ward	29.11.17	5.12.17	2, 4, 5
Cllr Fred Cowell	Thurlow Park ward	29.11.17	-	-
Cllr Max Deckers-Dowber	Thurlow Park ward	29.11.17	-	-
Sue Foster	Strategic Director: Neighbourhoods and Growth	27.11.17	28.11.17	
Raj Mistry	Environment	22.11.17	28.11.17	-
Andrew Burton	Capital Programmes	13.11.17	22.11.17	none
Maria Burton	Democratic Services	13.11.17	16.11.17	4.18
Jean-Marc Moccarme	Legal	13.11.17	20.11.17	-
Ian Speed	Finance	13.11.17	22.11.17	3
Simon Phillips	Planning, Transport & Development	13.11.17	-	-
Andrew Round	Sustainability	13.11.17	14.11.17	9.1.1
Conor McDonagh	Delivery Lead: Norwood	13.11.17	20.11.17	-
Russell Trewartha	Capital Programmes	08.11.17	08.11.17	Throughout

Report History	
Original discussion with Cabinet Member	Ongoing since 2015
Part II Exempt from Disclosure/confidential accompanying report?	No
Key decision report	Yes
Date first appeared on forward plan	15 th December 2017
Key decision reasons	Expenditure, income or savings in excess of £500,000
Background information	TfL Healthy Streets, http://content.tfl.gov.uk/healthy-streets-for-london.pdf Lambeth Air Quality Action Plan, https://www.lambeth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/pcc-air-quality-action-plan-2017-2022.pdf Quietway 7, http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/quietway7
Appendices	Appendix A – Q7 Route Summary (2017) Appendix B – Traffic surveys (2017) Appendix C – Collision report (2017) Appendix D – General arrangement drawings (2017) Appendix E – Early engagement report (2015) Appendix F – West Dulwich consultation report (2016) Appendix G – Thurlow Park Rd/Rosendale Rd consultation report (2016) Appendix H – Gipsy Hill consultation report (2016) Appendix I – Response to stakeholder feedback (2017) Appendix J – Informal consultation report (2017)

APPROVAL BY CABINET MEMBER IN ACCORDANCE WITH SCHEME OF DELEGATION

I confirm I have consulted Finance, Legal and Democratic Services and taken account of their advice and comments in completing the report for approval:

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Post: Jimmy Hall
Project Manager, Capital Programmes, Neighbourhoods and Growth

I approve the above recommendations:

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Post: Councillor Jennifer Brathwaite
Cabinet Member for Housing and Environment

Any declarations of interest (or exemptions granted): None

Any conflicts of interest: None

Any dispensations: None