

Dulwich Community Council

Tuesday 24 January 2012

7.00 pm

The Community Suite, St Barnabas Church, 40 Calton Avenue, London
SE21 7DG

Membership

Councillor Lewis Robinson (Chair)
Councillor Robin Crookshank Hilton (Vice-Chair)
Councillor James Barber
Councillor Toby Eckersley
Councillor Helen Hayes
Councillor Jonathan Mitchell
Councillor Michael Mitchell
Councillor Rosie Shimell
Councillor Andy Simmons

Members of the committee are summoned to attend this meeting

Annie Shepperd

Chief Executive

Date: Monday 16 January 2012



Order of Business

- | Item No. | Title |
|----------|--|
| 1. | INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME |
| 2. | APOLOGIES |
| 3. | DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS |

Members are asked to declare any interest or dispensation and the nature of that interest or dispensation which they may in any of the items under consideration at this meeting.

Item No.	Title	Time
4.	ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT	
5.	MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Pages 4 - 14)	
	MAIN BUSINESS	
6.	DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS (Pages 15 - 17)	7.10 pm
	Members to consider the deputation requests which are contained within the report.	
7.	COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PRESENTATIONS	7.25 pm
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation on Dulwich Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) • Southwark Civic Awards • Bowel Cancer UK • Veolia Environmental Services • LINK Southwark Leadership Group announcement 	
8.	GROVE VALE FIRST AND SECOND STAGE CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE (CPZ) STUDY (Pages 18 - 66)	7.45 pm
9.	SAFER NEIGHBOURHOODS TEAMS UPDATE	8.45 pm
	An update on community safety matters in the Dulwich Community Council area.	
	BREAK AT 9.00 PM	
	Opportunity for residents to talk to Councillors and Officers.	
10.	DEVELOPING HEALTH AND CARE SERVICES	9.10 pm
	Officer presentation on Developing Health and Care Services in Dulwich.	
11.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (Page 67)	9.25 pm
	This is an opportunity for public questions addressed to the chair.	
	Residents or persons working in the borough may ask questions on any matter in relation to which the Council has powers or duties.	
	Response may be supplied in writing following the meeting.	

Item No.	Title	Time
12.	LOCAL PARKING AMENDMENTS (Pages 68 - 76)	9.35 pm
	Executive Function	
	Members to consider local parking schemes contained within the report.	
13.	COMMUNITY COUNCILS HIGHWAYS AND LIGHTING CAPITAL INVESTMENT (Pages 77 - 82)	9.45 pm
	Executive Function	
	Members to consider the Highways Capital funding report for the allocation of selected schemes in the Dulwich area.	

Date: Monday 16 January 2012

INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

CONTACT: Beverley Olamijulo, Constitutional Officer, Tel: 020 7525 7234 or email: beverley.olamijulo@southwark.gov.uk
Website: www.southwark.gov.uk

ACCESS TO INFORMATION

On request, agendas and reports will be supplied to members of the public, except if they contain confidential or exempted information.

ACCESSIBLE MEETINGS

The council is committed to making its meetings accessible. For further details on building access, translation and interpreting services, the provision of signers and other access requirements, please contact the Constitutional Officer.

Disabled members of the public, who wish to attend community council meetings and require transport assistance in order to attend, are requested to contact the Constitutional Officer. The Constitutional Officer will try to arrange transport to and from the meeting. There will be no charge to the person requiring transport. Please note that it is necessary to contact us as far in advance as possible, and at least three working days before the meeting.

BABYSITTING/CARERS' ALLOWANCES

If you are a resident of the borough and have paid someone to look after your children or an elderly or disabled dependant, so that you can attend this meeting, you may claim an allowance from the council. Please collect a claim form from the Constitutional Officer at the meeting.

DEPUTATIONS

Deputations provide the opportunity for a group of people who are resident or working in the borough to make a formal representation of their views at the meeting. Deputations have to be regarding an issue within the direct responsibility of the Council. For further information on deputations, please contact the Constitutional Officer.

**For a large print copy of this pack,
please telephone 020 7525 7234.**

Dulwich Community Council

Language Needs

If you would like information on the Community Councils translated into your language please telephone 020 7525 7234 or visit the officers at 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2TZ

Spanish:

Necesidades de Idioma

Si usted desea información sobre los Municipios de la Comunidad traducida a su idioma por favor llame al 020 7525 7234 o visite a los oficiales de 160 Tooley Street, Londres SE1 2TZ

Portuguese:

Necessidades de Linguagem

Se você gostaria de informação sobre Community Councils (Concelhos Comunitários) traduzida para sua língua, por favor, telefone para 020 7525 7234 ou visite os oficiais em 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2TZ

Arabic:

إحتياجات لغوية
إذا كنت ترغب في الحصول على معلومات عن مجالس المجموعات المحلية وترجمتها إلى لغتك
الرجاء الإتصال برقم الهاتف: 020 7525 7234 أو زيارة المكتب في 160 Tooley Street
SE1 2TZ London

French:

Besoins de Langue

Si vous désirez obtenir des renseignements sur les Community Councils traduits dans votre langue, veuillez appeler le 020 7525 7234 ou allez voir nos agents à 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2TZ

Bengali :

ভাষার প্রয়োজন

আপনি যদি নিজের ভাষায় কমিউনিটি কাউন্সিল সম্পর্কে তথ্য পেতে চান তাহলে 020 7525 7234 নম্বরে ফোন করুন অথবা 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2TZ ঠিকানায় গিয়ে অফিসারদের সাথে দেখা করুন।

Yoruba:

Awon Kosemani Fun Ede

Bi o ba nfe àlàyé kíkún l'ori awon Ìgbimò Àwùjo ti a se ayipada si ede abíníbí re, jọwọ tẹ wa l'aago si ori nomba yi i : 020 7525 7234 tabi ki o yo ju si awon òṣiṣé òsisé ni ojúlé 160 Tooley Street , London SE1 2TZ .

Turkish:

Dil İhtiyaçları

Eğer Community Councils (Toplum Meclisleri) ile ilgili bilgilerin kendi ana dilinize çevrilmesini istiyorsanız, lütfen 020 7525 7234 numaralı telefonu arayınız veya 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2TZ adresindeki memurları ziyaret ediniz.

Krio:

Na oose language you want

If you lek for sabi all tin but Community Council na you yone language, do ya telephone 020 7525 7234 or you kin go talk to dee officesr dem na 160 Tooley Treet, London SE1 2TZ.



DULWICH COMMUNITY COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Dulwich Community Council held on Monday 7 November 2011 at 7.00 pm at The Community Suite, St Barnabas Church, 40 Calton Avenue, London SE21 7DG

PRESENT: Councillor Lewis Robinson (Chair)
 Councillor Robin Crookshank Hilton (Vice-Chair)
 Councillor James Barber
 Councillor Toby Eckersley
 Councillor Helen Hayes
 Councillor Jonathan Mitchell
 Councillor Michael Mitchell
 Councillor Rosie Shimell
 Councillor Andy Simmons

OFFICER SUPPORT: Gill Davies, Director of Environment & Leisure
 Barbara Selby, Head of Transport Planning
 Matt Hill, Public Realm Programme Manager
 John McHenry, Markets Development Manager
 Abdi Mohamed-Ibrahim, Neighbourhood Co-ordinator
 Grace Semakula, Community Council Development Officer
 Beverley Olamijulo, Constitutional Officer

1. INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

The chair welcomed councillors, members of the public and officers to the meeting.

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies for lateness was received from Councillor Rosie Shimell.

3. DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

There were none.

4. ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

There were none.

5. MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2011 be agreed as an accurate record of that meeting and signed by the chair subject to an amendment:

Item 7, community announcements and presentations: The Southwark Legal Advice Network presentation should include under the second line the word "surgery" so it reads:

The first event on 26 September 2011 was a drop in surgery in providing and offering legal advice for the over 50s etc.

6. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS

Dulwich Community Council considered a deputation request from local residents and parents concerning the current proposals to remove funding of the school crossing patrols in Dulwich Village in the next financial year.

They voiced their concerns about the council's proposal to withdraw funding for school crossing patrols in and around Red Post Hill, East Dulwich Grove and Townley Road.

The spokesperson for the deputation, outlined that road safety was of paramount importance and should be the responsibility of the council. Local residents had grave concerns about the council's proposal to withdraw this funding and had asked if the council could consider securing £15,000 for the next 3 years to fund the patrol guards in Dulwich. They would also like to see this process to be as open and engaging as possible when considering any future funding.

In response to questions addressed to the spokesperson the following was highlighted:

- Educating children about road safety awareness and promoting children's health.
- Risk of potential accidents when cars ignore the pedestrian traffic signals when they change at the time cars are meant to stop and people cross the road.
- The increased number of cyclists also makes the area a danger for pedestrians.
- Traffic calming measures could cause further problems rather than being a preventative measure.

Gill Davies, Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure responded to the deputation. She explained that discussions were in place with stakeholders and residents. Each of the schools would be contacted with an open and transparent agenda in these meetings. Any feedback would be provided to the cabinet members for information.

The general comments from the audience were the council needed to ensure the business association are involved, also TfL had a massive budget the council should approach them to raise the £15k to retain the school patrol guards and any consultation with the local community should be given careful consideration.

Members submitted a motion that which was unanimously agreed at Community Council.

The agreed motion is set out below:

Dulwich Community Council notes the following on page 15 of the Council's recently-adopted "Sustainable Modes of Travel Strategy":

"The safety of children on the road requires special attention" and therefore urges the Council's Cabinet to remove the threat to the school crossing patrols at the junctions of East Dulwich Grove with Townley Road/Greendale and with Dulwich Village/Red Post Hill/Village Way, and to secure the permanent funding of the existing patrols at those locations".

The chair thanked Gill Davies for responding to questions.

7. COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PRESENTATIONS

Colour Thief – cancelled event

The chair read out a statement about the cancelled event as a result of public concern. He referred to a letter he received from cabinet member, Cllr Veronica Ward about the scheduled event in Southwark Park. Further consultation on an event in the South of the borough is still ongoing.

Cleaner greener safer application forms – 2012 - 2013

The chair announced the launch of the Cleaner Greener Safer funding which was divided among all eight of the community council areas. The amount allocated to all eight is £220,000.

The chair mentioned the criteria and the types of projects that have previously been awarded funding and highlighted the time limit set for the funding programme. Officers were available during the break to answer questions. People were also encouraged to visit the council's website to download a CGS e-form.

Libraries review

The chair announced that none of the libraries would be closed and Dulwich Library, Kingswood and Grove Vale would remain open.

Council Assembly

The chair announced the next Council Assembly meeting would be held at Charter School, Red Post Hill on Tuesday, 29 November 2011 at 7.00pm. The theme would be Housing. He urged people to attend the meeting so their concerns regarding the School Patrol

Guards were made to the relevant cabinet member, Cllr Barrie Hargrove.

Kingswood Community Scheme

Janice Francois from the Kingswood Community Scheme spoke briefly about a 'community day' event which was held in the summer. About 400 to 500 people attended and there were different dishes (e.g. Indian and African) and a diversity of activities which took place on the day. Cllr Robinson said he was a great day and Councillor Hayes thanked representatives of the Kingswood Community Network.

Dulwich Helpline

Barbara Scott from Dulwich Helpline spoke about the community council funded grant of £500 which was used to organise a day trip to Southend for another group called Life on the Edge which is affiliated to Dulwich Helpline. The project caters for those with limited mobility. The rest of the funding would be used to organise another trip in the New Year. Barbara raised concern about the future funding of Dulwich Helpline particularly with the pending cuts that are due to take place within the council. The chair said he fully understood the concern and appreciated the project's work.

Millwall Football Scheme

Richard White and representatives from Millwall Football Scheme talked about the project and the opportunities it offers to them as young people. One representative said he had been an aspiration to be involved in the project which meets weekly with around 40 young people attending. The project offers coaching sessions at JAGS. They thanked the community council, especially Cllr Crookshank Hilton's involvement to keep the scheme going.

Home Energy Efficiency Scheme

Laura Hale introduced a new area based scheme called RE:NEW which offers advice on energy efficiency and improvement service to residents living in East Dulwich ward and neighbouring Nunhead ward. It aims to reduce CO2 emissions from existing homes. The scheme would run until the end of March 2012. Further details of the scheme were circulated at the meeting and are available on the Southwark website.

8. SAFER NEIGHBOURHOOD TEAMS UPDATE

Sergeant Turnbull submitted his apologies at this meeting.

Sergeant Warran from College safer neighbourhood team provided an update on community safety matters and outlined the SNTs ward priorities for College, East Dulwich and Village:

- Residential burglary
- Theft from motor vehicles
- Anti social behaviour

Residential burglaries: SNTs are providing crime prevention leaflets and delivering notices

to premises to those that are most vulnerable. It was reported that two males had been arrested and one recently charged with three burglaries in the Dulwich area.

Theft from motor vehicles: Crime prevention measures offered to car owners around the area.

Anti-social behaviour: Involving drugs around the Peckarman's Wood area the police stopped vehicles and searched for drugs. It was announced that a police surgery would take place on Monday 28 November 2011 at the TRA Hall on Dawson Heights Estate.

Sergeant Warran took questions from the audience on raising the priority of traffic policing, the high level of burglaries in the East Dulwich area and whether the change in shift and joined up SNTs might have affected the rise.

In response Sergeant Warran stated that speed monitoring equipment was frequently used and fixed penalty notices were issued to motorists caught speeding. In relation to reported burglaries these are routinely monitored by the SNTs, he agreed to feedback these concerns to Sergeant Turnbull.

The chair thanked Sgt Warran for his presentation.

9. TRANSPORT AND TRAFFIC ISSUES IN DULWICH

Barbara Selby, Head of transport planning and representatives of Transport for London (TfL) spoke about the Southwark transport plan which sets out long term goals and transport objectives for the borough which would be a 20 year programme.

It would also include a 3 year programme of investment and the targets and the outcomes the council are hope to achieve. The Southwark Transport Plan was in response to the Mayor's Transport Strategy and other relevant policies.

Details of the Transport Plan could be found on the Southwark website it includes information about transport objectives, a delivery plan that would be costed and funded plan, performance monitoring plan and locally specific targets which would be used to assess whether the plan is delivering its objectives.

Matt Hill from Public Realm spoke about the options for the Paxton Green roundabout.

Option 1: A map of the location was shown at the meeting indicating the proposed the changes in conjunction with Lambeth and TfL. It would address road safety issues known as the 'convention solution'. Officers would be consulting on this possibly in the new year or around Spring in 2012.

Option 2: The creation of a priority junction to make it more useable. The council would consult again about the pedestrian space within the vicinity of the roundabout. It would address the parking issue as well particular with regard to disabled parking.

The officer took questions from the audience about the cost element of this project. Matt explained options 1 and 2 were in the preliminary stages and any changes whether it be relatively modest would be expensive, but would make a profound difference to what it is

now.

Cllr Hayes commented on the traffic light crossing by the Paxton Green Group Practice stating that in the short term adjustments to the phasing of traffic lights should be looked at in the short term.

Barbara said she had contacted TfL and asked if this could be looked at. Some people felt that a pedestrian phase was not always the solution, as it slowed down traffic. Others felt that the focus should be on those junctions which have a higher rate of reported casualties and accidents.

People in the audience asked whether the consultation meetings would involve local businesses as there were not many people from the Kingswood area at the meeting.

TfL representative, Dan Johnson explained the cost of the works would be taken from TfL's capital funding and possibly S106 monies would be incorporated in this.

Other views expressed included:

Red Post Hill traffic islands especially where cars are parked close to the islands, made it difficult for transport buses to manoeuvre around them. The Council should therefore consider repositioning the islands, or introduce double yellow lines.

A short debate on controlled parking in the area was discussed. A local trader referred to the length of time for short stay parking and the problems with commuter parking. He said it was important for these views to be taken into account when a final decision on controlled parking would be considered by the relevant cabinet member, Cllr Hargrove.

10. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The following questions were asked:

Q1 How are contracts for car clubs conducted? How does the Council decide on who gets the contract?

A1: Follow up response to be given by the next community council.

Q2 What are the future plans for Car Club expansion in the borough?

A2: Follow up response to be given by the next community council.

11. NORTH CROSS ROAD MARKET, 6 MONTH REVIEW ON THE ROAD CLOSURE

John McHenry presented this item.

He stated the review of the market pitches would be referred back to the licensing committee for consideration. He confirmed that the road closure of Lordship Lane and Nutfield Road and any further matters discussed at community council would also be

conveyed to the licensing committee.

RESOLVED:

1. That details of reviewing the extension of pitches designation and experimental road closure be noted.
2. That it be noted that no further variation of the designation is required following the review.
3. That the community council supports the extension of the Saturday experimental road closure at the junction with Lordship Lane for a further period of twelve months, and then permanently if there are no further objections.
4. That an application to extend parking restrictions on Saturdays (excluding Fridays) to ensure there is no parking on pitches during market hours be agreed.

12. COMMUNITY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS CAPITAL INVESTMENT 2012 - 2013

Executive Function

The following information had been provided by officers on the total underspend for the Dulwich Community Council area:

Total underspend brought forward (as per report) - £64,257.24

Division by ward:	Amount:
East Dulwich	£33,333
Village	£30,924.24
College	nil
Total	£64,257.24

RESOLVED:

Highways underspend

1. That the works set out below be funded:

East Dulwich ward North Cross Road	Carriageway, from junction with Lordship Lane as far east as budget allows	£33,333 Previous underspend for East Dulwich would also be spent on North Cross Road.
---------------------------------------	--	---

Village ward Half Moon Lane Project	Resurfacing of footway at shopping parade(s) 125 to 147	£4,000 Then roll over remaining £26,924.24 into next year's grant.
---	--	--

Lighting underspend

2. That the lighting underspend for Village ward be reallocated to new columns for Aysgarth Road as per the officer's recommendation.

Note: remaining funding will be considered at a future meeting.

13. LOCAL PARKING AMENDMENTS AND CAR CLUB EXPANSION

Executive Function

RESOLVED:

1. That the following local parking amendments, detailed in the appendices to the report, be approved for implementation subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory procedures:
 - Colby Road – installation of an 'At any time' waiting restriction (double yellow lines).
 - Cyrena Road – relocation of an existing car club bay from the east side of the road to the west side of the road.
2. That the item on the car club expansion be deferred. This is to allow for further information to be received on the proposed car club locations, particularly with regard to the consultation process that would take place with local residents and ward members.
3. That the local parking schemes for Dulwich Wood Avenue and Stradella Road be deferred for further clarification on the schemes.

14. CLEANER GREENER SAFER FUNDING - CHANGE CONTROL REPORT

Executive Function

RESOLVED:

1. That £6,500 of Cleaner, Greener, Safer underspend in Village ward be reallocated to the Dulwich Cherry Blossom Festival planting scheme. Locations which were not completed last year to be confirmed: plantings in new locations priority to Winterbrook Road and Milo Road in that order.
2. That £2,500 be reallocated to Dulwich Finger post repairs (list to follow) which was provided to local ward members by the Chair of the Dulwich Society on 25 October 2011.
3. That all other underspend be consolidated and put on hold in case of emergency or possibly rollover into next year's award.

15. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**RESOLVED:**

That the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1 and 2, Access to Information Procedure rules of the Constitution.

16. LEA SCHOOL GOVERNOR APPOINTMENTS

Executive Function

RESOLVED:

1. That Ms Philippa Beagley and Mrs Caroline George be appointed to Goodrich Primary School.
2. That Ms Sheona St. Hilaire be appointed to Goose Green Primary School.
3. That Mrs Eva Dudzicki be appointed to St. Anthony's Catholic Primary School.

The meeting ended at 10:15pm

CHAIR:

DATED:

Feedback about issues raised at previous community council meetings

Question	Response
<p>Questions raised at community council on 7 November 2011</p> <p>Question 1: How are contracts for car clubs conducted? How does the Council decide on who gets the contract?</p>	<p>Responses provided by Tim Walker, Environment & Leisure</p> <p>The procurement of services, decision making and contract award are made by following EU regulations and council procedures.</p> <p>EU regulations place thresholds upon the method for procurement, particularly this looks at the value of the contract to be awarded.</p> <p>In the case of the car club contract (2010) the value of the contract fell below the EU threshold that requires the council to meet certain legal requirements. Instead the council followed its own procedures through a competitive quotation process. This involved the council publishing an "Expression of Interest" in a relevant journal, short listing, panel interviews and ultimately a Key Decision by the relevant Chief Officer; at that time the Director of Environment and Housing. This report is known as a Gateway report.</p> <p>Before the Chief Officer takes the key decision the council's own procedures require scrutiny of the decision by either the Departmental Contract Review Board (DCRB) or Corporate Contract Review Board (CCRB). In this case, the DCRB considered a Gateway 1/2 report which set out how the procurement was carried out and also evaluated the draft contract.</p>
<p>Question 2: What are the future plans for Car Club expansion in the Borough?</p>	<p>The existing contract commenced in March 2010 and is for the provision a car club service for a two year period. It contains a number of monitoring clauses. The contract provides the council with the option to extend for a 12 month period or periods.</p> <p>The council is currently considering its options in advance of March 2012.</p> <p>It is worth noting that Streetcar very recently merged with Zipcar; the existing contract is currently being novated to Zipcar.</p>

Item No. 6.	Classification: Open	Date: 24 January 2012	Meeting Name: Dulwich Community Council
Report title:		Deputation Requests – Grove Vale Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All wards within the Dulwich Community Council area	
From:		Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the Dulwich Community Council consider deputation requests from the following representatives mentioned below which relates to the agenda item on Grove Vale CPZ:
 - South Southwark Business Association (SSBA)
 - Zenoria Street residents
 - Derwent Grove residents
 - Glengarry Road, Trossachs Road, Tarbert Road and Thorncombe residents
 - Elsie Road residents

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. Deputation requests have been submitted by representatives of those mentioned above. A deputation can be submitted by a person of any age who lives, works or studies in Southwark. Deputations must relate to matters which the council has powers or duties or which affects Southwark.
3. The deputations relate to a report on the Grove Vale CPZ which is contained in the agenda.

The deputations outline the following:

1. South Southwark Business Association:

The South Southwark Business Association (SSBA) will be objecting to the CPZ proposals in and around Grove Vale on the grounds that the introduction of controlled parking will be detrimental and damaging to business, the local economy and the community as a whole.

2. Zenoria Street residents:

Residents in this street are against the proposed option for the CPZ because Zenoria Street is a small residential street, directly off the north end of Lordship Lane and suffers enormously from the deleterious effects of all kinds of parking; short, medium and long term (especially at weekends). The street is a prime parking location for people using the amenities on Lordship Lane and the proposed parking restrictions of an hour during weekdays will be of no benefit to residents. Any spaces freed up by the removal of long term parking will rapidly be taken up by the medium and short term parking of people using the amenities on Lordship

Lane. There is regularly a steady flow of cars cruising up the street searching for parking spaces in addition to double parking. This proposal will also have no impact at weekends when the pressure on parking and the impact on residents is at its greatest. Residents will only end up paying for the privilege of not being able to park in their street, something we can currently do for free.

The one hour exclusion will only work in streets where only long term parking is a problem. Zenoria Street is desperately in need of an effective solution to the ever present parking and congestion problems it suffers and the only CPZ scheme that will work for is an all day restriction that also includes weekends. In the absence of this then no restrictions will be better than the limited one hour a day. They ask that the community council reject the proposed scheme for Zenoria Street and support local residents in their opposition.

3. Derwent Grove residents

The deputation represents the views of the residents of Derwent Grove who support the insulation of the CPZ.

Many of Derwent Grove residents have voted in favour of CPZ as it is the only solution we have at present to rid our street of the many commuters who use it as the East Dulwich Railway car park. The Council parking officers have proven that this is the case having monitored the parking on our street. Both the businesses in Grove Vale and the residents are affected by the commuters.

We would ask the council to consider the implementation of a CPZ with restricted parking for one or maximum of two hours a day. We would be grateful for an opportunity to represent this side of the argument.

4. Elsie Road residents:

Residents of Elsie Road would like to present some figures which do not correspond to the figures published in the report and for this additional information to be taken into consideration when the community council decides how to reflect the community's views in their decisions on the proposed CPZ.

5. Glengarry, Trossachs, Tarbert and Thorncombe residents

Residents of Glengarry, Trossachs, Tarbert and Thorncombe Roads which are outside the proposed zone, are also affected. The Council should acknowledge the effects on the wider residents in the community.

- 4.. At the meeting, the spokesperson for the deputation will be invited to speak up to five minutes on the subject matter. The community council will debate the deputation and at the conclusion of the deputation the chair will seek the consent of councillors to debate the subject. Councillors may move motions and amendments without prior notice if the subject does not relate to a report on the agenda. The meeting can decide to note the deputation or provide support if requested to do so. The community council shall not take any formal decision(s) on the subject raised unless a report is on the agenda
5. Any relevant resource or community impact issues will be contained in the comments of the strategic director.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

6. The deputation shall consist of no more than six persons, including the spokesperson.
7. Only one member of the deputation shall be allowed to address the meeting, her or his speech being limited to five minutes.
8. Councillors may ask questions of the deputation, which shall be answered by their spokesperson or any member of the deputation nominated by her or him for up to five minutes at the conclusion of the spokesperson's address.
9. If more than one deputation is to be heard in respect of one subject there shall be no debate until each deputation has been presented.
The monitoring officer shall, in writing, formally communicate the decision of the meeting to the person who submitted the request for the deputation to be received.

SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS

Comments of the Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure

10. A report relating to this subject is contained elsewhere on the agenda.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Deputations from South Southwark Business Association and residents of Zenoria Street, Elsie Street, Derwent Grove, Glengarry, Trossachs, Tarbert, and Thorncombe Roads	160 Tooley Street, London SE1P 5LX	Beverley Olamijulo 020 7525 7234

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Alexa Coates, Principal Constitutional Officer	
Report Author	Beverley Olamijulo, Constitutional Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	13 January 2012	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	No	No
Finance Director	No	No
Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure	No	No
Date final report sent to the Community Councils Team		13 January 2012

Item No. 8.	Classification: Open	Date: 24 January 2012	Meeting Name: Dulwich Community Council
Report title:		Grove Vale Controlled Parking Zone 1 st and 2 nd stage report	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		East Dulwich Ward and South Camberwell Ward	
From:		Head of Public Realm	

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Note that this report is presented to the community council for consultation purposes only and that the final decision is delegated to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Recycling.
2. Consider and note the results of the supporting Grove Vale 1st and 2nd stage Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) consultation report (the 'consultation report').
3. Consider the options contained within consultation report which are summarised below:

Option 1. Not to proceed with the installation of a CPZ in any of the Grove Vale study area.

Option 2. Not to proceed with the installation of a CPZ in any of the Grove Vale study area but carry out minor changes.

Option 3. Introduce a one hour CPZ on an experimental basis in Derwent Grove only.

Option 4. Introduce a one hour CPZ on an experimental basis in the following streets only: Derwent Grove, Elsie Road, Jarvis Road, Melbourne Grove, Oxonian Street, Tintagel Crescent and Zenoria Street.

Option 5. Introduce a one hour CPZ on an experimental basis in the following streets only: Derwent Grove, Elsie Road and Tintagel Crescent.

4. Give comment to the options above (or make alternative suggestion) and note that any comments or suggestions made will be included within the final report to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Recycling scheduled for February 2012.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

5. Approval to consult residents on the principal and detail of a possible CPZ in the Grove Vale area was given by Dulwich Community Council on 15 September 2011 and by Camberwell Community Council on 22 September 2011.
6. Informal public consultation took place with all residents and businesses within the 2011 until 11 November 2011.

7. Full detail of the consultation strategy, results, options and conclusions can be found in the consultation report.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

8. In accordance with Part 3H paragraph 20 and 22 of the council's constitution community councils are to be consulted on strategic matters such as the introduction of a CPZ. In practise this is carried out before and after the public consultation.
9. In accordance with Part 3D paragraph 22 of the council's constitution the decision to implement a new CPZ lies with the individual Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Recycling.
10. The community council is now being given opportunity to make final representations to the options that have arisen following public consultation detailed in the consultation report.

Policy implications

11. The recommendations contained within this report are consistent with the policies of the PEP and the Transport Plan 2011, particularly:

Policy 1.1 – pursue overall traffic reduction

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

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

- By managing the supply of parking, CPZs are significant in releasing suppressed demand for sustainable modes, such as walking, cycling and public

Policy 4.2 – create places that people can enjoy

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

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

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

Community impact statement

12. The implementation and operation of the CPZ contributes to an improved environment through the elimination of on-street commuter parking and the

associated reduction of local and borough-wide traffic levels.

13. The consultation leaflet met communication guidance with a languages page with advice of how to access the council's translation services. Large format leaflets were available for those with visual impairment.
14. The implementation of a CPZ may benefit disabled motorists by reducing parking demand in locations that currently allow unrestricted parking.
15. The council will continue to provide its normal service for the provision of 'origin' disabled bays outside residents homes who meet the relevant criteria.
16. The implementation of a CPZ will provide greater protection of parking spaces to all residents and their visitors living within the zone. This prioritisation of space provides a benefit to all resident permit holders.
17. The overall implementation of a CPZ may disbenefit those persons who currently drive to the area who will now be required to pay for parking during the operational hours of pay and display or be excluded if staying longer than the permitted maximum stay at a pay and display bay.

Resource implications

18. This report is for the purposes of consultation only and there are no resource implications associated with it.
19. It is, however, noted that this projected is funded by an allocation from Transport for London for this purpose.

Consultation

20. The two community councils were consulted prior to commencement of the study, as detailed in paragraph 5.
21. Informal public consultation was carried out in October and November 2011, as detailed in paragraph 6.
22. This report provides a opportunity for final comment to be made by the community council prior to a key decision scheduled to be taken by the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Recycling in February 2012.
23. Any areas that are approved for CPZ implementation will be subject statutory consultation required in the making of any permanent Traffic Management Orders.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Grove Vale 1 st and 2 nd Stage Controlled Parking Zone consultation report	Southwark Council Environment Public Realm Network Development 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Tim Walker 020 7525 2021
Transport Plan 2011	Southwark Council Environment Public Realm Network Development 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH Online: http://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/200107/transport_policy/1947/southwark_transport_plan_2011	Tim Walker 020 7525 2021
Grove Vale CPZ, Appendices	Southwark Council Environment Public Realm Network Development 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Paul Gellard 020 7525 7764

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Grove Vale CPZ, Consultation Report

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Tim Walker, Senior Engineer	
Report Author	Paul Gellard, Transport and Projects Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	20 December 2011	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director for Communities, Law and Governance	No	No
Finance Director	No	No
Cabinet Member	Yes	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	20 December 2011	



Grove Vale

1st and 2nd stage CPZ consultation report

January 2012 – DRAFT FOR COMMUNITY COUNCIL

www.southwark.gov.uk

Grove Vale

1st and 2nd stage CPZ consultation report

January 2012

www.southwark.gov.uk

Section A – Introduction and policy context.....	3
Section B – Study methods and decision making.....	5
Background of study.....	5
History of parking consultations in the area	5
CPZ requests.....	6
Project structure	6
Consultation area	7
Existing parking arrangements in the Grove Vale consultation area	9
Consultation document.....	10
Public exhibitions	11
Further information	11
Parking surveys	11
Section C – Consultation area questionnaire results summary	12
Summary of response rate	12
Headline consultation results.....	14
Supplementary questionnaire on driveway parking	23
Consultation responses from outside the study area	26
Communications made outside of the freepost or online questionnaire	28
Stakeholder communication.....	30
Summary of petitions and informal surveys.....	31
Section D – Parking stress survey summary.....	33
Headline results	33
Section E – Grove Vale CPZ parking demand and initial design	35
Section F – Study conclusions and recommendations	38
Grove Vale study area options	41
List of figures	44
List of appendices	44
Version control	44

Section A – Introduction and policy context

This report details the findings of a study on the possibility of introducing parking controls in the Grove Vale area. It provides the evidence base for the associated key decision report which sets out recommendations for the cabinet member for transport, environment and recycling.

Southwark Council has twenty Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) in operation (appendix 1) which have been introduced over a period of almost 40 years. This time span reflects the historical and continued challenge, faced by every local authority, in matching the demand by drivers to park their cars with a finite supply of on-street parking spaces.

The Parking and Enforcement Plan¹ (PEP) sets out the council's policy in the management of parking on its public highway. The PEP acknowledges that few things polarise public opinion more than parking but that restrictions, in many areas of the borough, provide a critical tool in prioritising space in favour of certain groups (e.g. blue badge holders, residents or loading) as well as assisting in keeping the traffic flowing and improving road safety.

The PEP was adopted as a supporting document to the council's 2006 transport strategy, the Local Implementation Plan² (LIP) which has recently been revised, consulted upon and adopted as the Transport Plan³.

The Transport Plan, incorporating Southwark's Local implementation plan (Lip), is a statutory document, prepared under Section 145 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999. Southwark's Transport Plan responds to the revised Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS), the Sub Regional Transport Plans (SRTPs), Southwark's Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) and other relevant policies.

Amongst its eight key objectives, the Transport Plan sets out the council's aim to "encourage sustainable travel choices" and "reduce the impact of transport on the environment".

The plan sets a target to reduce traffic levels by 3% by 2013.

The Transport Plan states "the council supports the introduction of CPZs as an important traffic demand management tool. CPZs do not provide long-stay parking for commuters and therefore existing zones assist in reducing car trips within those zones as well as trips across and through the borough".

¹ http://www.southwark.gov.uk/Uploads/FILE_42772.pdf

² <http://www.southwark.gov.uk/YourServices/transport/lip/>

³ http://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/200107/transport_policy/1947/southwark_transport_plan_2011

It continues that “parking controls are also significant in releasing suppressed demand for sustainable modes, such as walking, cycling and public transport.”

It is important to recognise that the majority of households in Southwark do not have access to a car and the needs of this majority must also be considered in the allocation of street space.

Parking is the end result of a trip. The availability of parking at a destination has a clear effect on whether the trip is made by car or not. Existing parking controls all across Southwark already assist in improving traffic and congestion levels.

The council has a duty⁴ to provide suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway as well as securing “the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians)”.

Southwark’s roads provide a finite supply of parking space, limited by various existing measures for example to: improve safety (eg. pedestrian crossings), reduce congestion (eg. yellow lines), improve public journey times (eg. bus lanes) or encourage cycling (eg. cycle lanes).

The remaining space can generally be used for parking but in areas where exceeds supply the prioritisation of that remaining kerb space becomes essential.

In practice, the council prioritises that remaining space through the introduction of CPZs as well as the installation of local parking restrictions outside of those zones, to manage local parking and loading requirements.

⁴ [Road Traffic Regulation Act, 1984](#), and [Traffic Management Act, 2004](#)

Section B – Study methods and decision making

Background of study

The Parking Enforcement Plan (PEP) refers generally to this area as East Dulwich. It suggests the area “may justify consideration of new zone” on the basis that it is close to a rail station with a mix of residential area (with a high density of car ownership per km²) as well as “employers or other attractions to visit the area”.

In 2010, the council made a funding bid to Transport for London (TfL) so that a study about parking could be carried out in the Grove Vale area. This bid was part of the council’s overall, annual bid to TfL for transport projects.

The consultation area concentrates on streets around Grove Vale, which are a short walking distance from East Dulwich railway station.

The streets were last consulted in 2002/3 as part of a wider Dulwich parking study. The 2002/3 study did not result in the installation of a CPZ. However, since the last parking consultation parking patterns and stress may have changed, this evidence is based on continued correspondence received from residents, requesting a CPZ consultation, particularly from those roads close to East Dulwich railway station.

History of parking consultations in the area

Date	Consultation	Outcome
2001-2003	<p>In late 2001 the Council commissioned Mott MacDonald Ltd to investigate the need for CPZ around three zone 2 stations in the area – Herne Hill, North Dulwich and East Dulwich stations.</p> <p>The first round of consultations was held in May 2002.</p> <p>The second round of consultations were held from October 2002 to December 2002</p>	<p>Second stage consultation (a more limited area than 1st stage): 1800 Leaflets were distributed to the East Dulwich area in October 2002.</p> <p>244 responses were received, representing a 13.6% response rate</p> <p>Majority (62%) perceived there to be a parking problem in the area.</p> <p>Majority (54%) were against the implementation of a CPZ in their street</p> <p>The streets that responded favourably to the CPZ proposals in the first round of consultation, Derwent Grove and Melbourne Grove, responded in favour of introducing CPZ measures. Those streets on the border of the zone including Tell and Matham Groves responded against the CPZ proposals.</p>

CPZ requests

In recent years, the council have received 44 requests from residents in the study area for a CPZ. This is where a resident has either made either a complaint or a general enquiry to the council, either directly to officers or via their elected members to request resident parking controls or a consultation. The highest number of requests have been received from East Dulwich Road (10) Derwent Grove (8), St Francis Road (6). It is noted that the broader Grove Vale and Lordship Lane area of Southwark has the highest concentration of these requests of anywhere in the borough.

Project structure

Since adoption of the PEP, the council has generally carried out it's CPZ projects by way of a two-stage consultation process⁵, except where the area limits are predetermined by physical, borough or existing CPZ boundaries or by budget constraints - in which case a joint 1st/2nd stage consultation may be carried out. This latter constraint formed the structure for the Grove Vale study.

First and second stage (combined) CPZ consultation

Parking occupancy and duration surveys are carried out to analyse who is parking in the area and for how long.

A questionnaire is sent out to every property within the area asking for opinions on the principal of a CPZ and whether or not they experience parking problems. During this stage we will consult on the detail of the zone, for example, we will ask views on the type and position of parking bays, the hours and days that the CPZ should operate and other detailed parking issues.

During consultation period, public exhibitions are held in which the local community were invited to meet officers to view and discuss the detailed design.

We will also ask our key stakeholders for their comments.

Consultation replies and parking data are used to make a decision whether or not to introduce a CPZ in the area.

A draft consultation and key decision report is produced and sent to the community council for comment.

The key decision is taken by the cabinet member for environment, transport and recycling on whether or not the CPZ is introduced.

More detail of the process is shown in Figure 1.

⁵ http://www.southwark.gov.uk/YourServices/transport/parking/cpzreviews/CPZ_how_consult/

Consultation area

A presentation of the consultation methods and boundaries was given and approved at Dulwich Community Council on 15 September 2011 and Camberwell Community Council on 22 September 2011.

The streets approved for consultation are situated within East Dulwich and South Camberwell Wards.

Road	No. of properties	Ward
Adys Road	4	South Camberwell
Besant Place	23	South Camberwell
Copleston Road	73	South Camberwell
Derwent Grove	82	East Dulwich
Dog Kennel Hill	3	South Camberwell
East Dulwich Grove	86	East Dulwich
East Dulwich Road	112	East Dulwich
Elsie Road	41	East Dulwich
Grove Vale*	300	East Dulwich / South Camberwell
Hayes Grove	66	South Camberwell
Jarvis Road	3	East Dulwich
Lordship Lane	24	East Dulwich
Melbourne Grove	86	East Dulwich
Oglander Road	1	South Camberwell
Ondine Road	114	South Camberwell
Oxonian Street	10	East Dulwich
Railway Rise	4	East Dulwich
St Francis Road	57	South Camberwell
Tintagel Crescent	35	East Dulwich
Tintagel Gardens	4	East Dulwich
Vale End	2	South Camberwell
Zenoria Street	29	East Dulwich
TOTAL	1159	

*Grove Vale is a boundary road between Camberwell and Dulwich community councils.

CPZ – 1st and 2nd stage combined (in principal and detailed design) consultation and study process




Figure 1

☆ Addendum – decision changed from strategic director to cabinet member on 25/5/11

Existing parking arrangements in the Grove Vale consultation area

Parking within the consultation area is predominantly uncontrolled but there are some restrictions that that prevent kerb-side parking. These are summarised as:

Existing restrictions within the consultation area that prevent kerb-side parking	Location
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus Priority measures (eg. Bus stops) 	Grove Vale and Lordship Lane. Historical restrictions at northern end of Melbourne Grove
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Origin disabled bays (outside residents homes who meets the council's criteria) 	11 installed throughout area, outside residents homes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School keep clear markings (marking to prevent parking at the school entrance) 	Tintagel Crescent
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road safety measures (eg. Formal pedestrian crossings) 	Grove Vale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short term free parking bays (to assist turn-over space for local businesses) 	Grove Vale and Melbourne Grove
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loading bays 	Elise Road and Zenoria Street
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car club parking bays 	Derwent Grove and Elsie Road
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local traffic management (single/double yellow lines to assist in sight lines and maintain traffic flow) 	Throughout the area there are local parking restrictions on some (but not all) junctions. More significant restrictions exist on East Dulwich Grove, Grove Vale and Lordship Lane.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicle crossovers allow access to private land (ie residential front driveways) parking is generally permitted but it can be enforced against by the council at request of the landowner (certain conditions apply) 	Various locations throughout the area. Predominantly in Elsie Road and Melbourne Grove.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dropped kerbs / raised footways – informal crossing points installed to assist pedestrian to cross the road and where parking is unlawful. 	Various locations throughout consultation area.

The above controls operate within the consultation area and are mapped in appendix 2. Additionally, there are existing CPZs in the surrounding neighbourhood that will likely have influence upon the supply of on-street parking through the effects of displacement. The nearest CPZs are South Camberwell (L CPZ) Herne Hill (HH CPZ) and Peckham town centre (B CPZ).

It should be noted that CPZs further afield, are also likely to play a part in impacting upon supply of on-street parking. CPZs in the north of Southwark (and across all central London authorities) prevent long-stay parking where motorists may otherwise choose to park and continue their journey on-foot to work. These other London CPZs are extensive in their area (covering all of transport Zone 1 and most of Zone 2) and provide protection to local residents; this may result in some motorists choosing to drive to outer rail stations or to locations that are adjacent to bus routes and then continuing on their journey by train or bus.

Consultation document

1159 postal addresses are located within the Grove Vale consultation area. This data was derived from the council's Local Land and Property Gazetteer (LLPG).

Distribution of the consultation documents (appendix 3) was made on 14 October 2011 by way of a blanket hand-delivery to all (residential and commercial) properties within the consultation area. The delivery was carried out by officers in the parking projects team.

The document was also sent to key and local stakeholders. Local stakeholders were identified as the cabinet member for environment, transport and recycling, ward members, Metropolitan Police Service, London Ambulance Service, London Fire Brigade, Transport for London, internal council teams and transport user groups.

The document was designed to present information on:

- Why the consultation was being carried out
- How recipients could contribute / decision making
- What the 1st and 2nd stage CPZ consultation was about
- Southwark's policy in regard to CPZ
- Frequently asked questions
- Indicative initial design drawing
- Website link to the online questionnaire and initial design drawing

By way of a questionnaire, the document sought the recipient's details and views on:

- Their address
- Whether they park (on-street)
- Current ability to park
- When problems occur
- Whether they agree with the proposed introduction of a CPZ in their street
- Whether their opinion would change if a CPZ was introduced in an adjacent street
- Initial design, including the positioning and type of parking bays
- Hours/days of enforcement
- Any other comments

The document followed Southwark's communications guidelines and provided detail on large print versions and translation services.

The questionnaire could be returned in a provided freepost envelope to the council's offices or completed online via Southwark's consultation webpage.

Documents were delivered on 14 October 2011 and the response period ran until 11 November 2011 (the usual period of 3 weeks for such consultations was extended because of the school half term). Officers accepted and inputted responses up to 14 November 2011.

Additionally, details of a phone number and email address were provided to those receiving the document should they wish to talk to an officer or email their comments. In those cases, officers provided assistance and advised residents that they should also complete their questionnaire as data from this formed the main basis of the results analysis.

Public exhibitions

The parking projects team held two public exhibitions at Grove Vale Library on:

- Saturday 5 November 2011, 10am-2pm

34* signed the exhibition attendance register (18 within consultation boundary / 16 outside)

- Wednesday 9 November 2011, 4pm-8pm

25* signed the exhibition attendance register (18 within consultation boundary / 7 outside)

* Figures only take into account those who actually signed the register

Further information

27 street notices were erected within the consultation area (appendix 4) on 17 October 2011. A copy of the street notices can be found in appendix 5. The notice provided contact details (telephone and email) for more detail on the consultation and advice of what to do if consultation packs had not been received.

The council's parking consultation webpage⁶ was also updated with detail of the active consultation, its process and how decisions would be taken. A selection of frequently asked questions in relation to CPZs also provided an additional source of information for those making enquiries as to what a CPZ could mean to them.

As mentioned above, a direct phone number and email address to the parking projects team was made available to allow those wishing to making enquires via those methods. Officers assisted with response and also recommended that the callers complete their questionnaire.

A supplementary questionnaire was also sent to residents with a dropped kerb, leasing to a private driveway, in Elsie Road and Melbourne Grove on their preferred restriction across their driveway.

Parking surveys

To quantify the parking situation, Count on Us were commissioned to undertake parking surveys on a weekday, Thursday 10 February 2011 and a weekend, Saturday 12 and Sunday 13 February 2011 to ascertain parking occupancy and duration of stay on all public highway roads within the consultation area. A summarised version of the parking beat surveys can be found in appendix 6.

⁶ http://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/200140/parking_projects

Section C – Consultation area questionnaire results summary

Summary of response rate

Figure 2 shows that the Grove Vale consultation yielded 241 returned questionnaires from within the consultation area, representing a 21% response rate. This is a good response rate for this type of consultation when compared with similar consultations in the borough and benchmarked against other London authorities.

The highest response rate was from Elsie Road (51%), the lowest were Dog Kennel Hill, Jarvis Road, Oglander Road, Railway Rise and Vale End with no responses. As there were only a few properties in these streets, this may explain the lack of responses. Figure 2.1 provides a graph of each streets response rate.

The PEP sets out that the council will give significant weight to the consultation return when it exceeds a 20% threshold. In accordance with the PEP, other local information sources (such as quantitative parking studies, future development, likely impact of surrounding parking controls and community council opinion) should be given greater weighting where the threshold is not reached.

A further 27 comments were made either by email, letter or phone.

Street	Delivered	Returned	Response rate	Telephone	Email/Letter	Total responses to consultation
Adys Road	4	2	50%		1	3
Besant Place	23	2	9%			2
Copleston Road	73	18	25%	1		19
Derwent Grove	82	31	38%	1	3	35
Dog Kennel Hill	3	0	0%			0
East Dulwich Grove	86	12	14%			12
East Dulwich Road	112	22	20%			22
Elsie Road	41	20	49%	3	4	27
Grove Vale	300	22	7%	1		23
Hayes Grove	66	6	9%			6
Jarvis Road	3	0	0%			0
Lordship Lane	24	1	4%			1
Melbourne Grove	86	17	20%	1	3	21
Oglander Road	1	0	0%			0
Ondine Road	114	36	32%	1	4	41
Oxonian Street	10	2	20%			2
Railway Rise	4	0	0%			0
St Francis Road	57	22	39%		1	23
Tintagel Crescent	35	13	37%		2	15
Tintagel Gardens	4	2	50%			2
Vale End	2	0	0%			0
Zenoria Street	29	13	45%	1		14
TOTAL	1159	241	21%	9	18	268

Figure 2

The options and recommendations are based on feedback received from the public consultation in conjunction with objective analysis of occupancy data from parking stress surveys.




Figure 2.1

Headline consultation results

- 1) 72% of questionnaire were returned by post and 28% submitted online.
- 2) 94% of responses were received from residential properties. Based upon OS land use survey data (appendix 7) this is reasonably representative of the area.
- 3) 6% of responses came from businesses, the majority of these coming from Grove Vale and Melbourne Grove.
- 4) It is worth noting that 18 duplicate responses have been omitted from the analysis. A duplicate is where a response, from the same property address, was submitted twice, by post and online.
- 5) The majority of duplicates were received from Derwent Grove (5) and St Francis Road (3).

Q1) Do you have off-street parking?

- 6) The vast majority (80%) of respondents do not have any off-street parking. It is therefore assumed that the remainder (20%) either have private driveways, estate parking or private car parks (ie small surface car parks most usually associated with small apartment blocks).
- 7) The highest proportion of off-street parking is in Elsie Road.

Q2) How many vehicles do you park on the street?

- 8) The majority of respondents have access to one or more vehicle. Only 10% of respondents in the study area don't have a vehicle. This response is unrepresentative for the ward where East Dulwich 39.8% and South Camberwell 48% don't have a car⁷ and Southwark (51.9%) – although these figures are based on 2001 census data. This may reflect the fact that car users are more likely to respond than non-users as they perceive themselves as more directly affected.
- 9) 67% of respondents park one vehicle on the public highway, detailed in Figure 3.




Figure 3

⁷ Office for National Statistics, Census Area Statistics, KS17

Q3) Please rate the ability to find an on-street parking space near this address?

10) Across the whole consultation area, when asked about *your* ability to find an on-street parking space: 44% found it easy or easy/moderate, 40% found it moderate/difficult or difficult. The results were similar but indicated that visitor parking was more difficult (37% easy or easy/moderate v 43% moderate/difficult or difficult). Figure 4

11) Tintagel Crescent (85%), Derwent Grove (65%) and Zenoria Street (54%) showed the highest proportion of respondents rating their ability to find an on-street parking space near their address as moderate/difficult or difficult.

12) Ondine Road (64%), St Francis Road (55%) and Grove Vale (45%) showed the highest proportion of respondents rating their ability to find an on-street parking space near their address as easy or easy/moderate. There was also a high proportion (100%) from Adys Road, Hayes Grove, and Lordship Lane. However, it should be noted that Hayes Grove has private off street parking and few responses were received from Adys Road and Lordship Lane.




Figure 4

Q4) What time of day do you or your visitors have difficulty parking?

13) Question 4 was provided to ascertain when respondents most felt parking difficulties occurred. Figure 5 details the overall responses. The largest response group expressed that their parking problems occurred weekdays during the daytime. The second largest group said that problems occurred during the weekday evenings, followed by Saturdays. The table provides a count of the top three responses from each option. Respondents could select as many or few times periods as they considered appropriate.

	You	Your visitors
Monday – Friday, daytime	22 – Derwent Grove 15 – Elsie Road 11 – Tintagel Crescent	22 - Derwent Grove 14 – Elsie Road 11 – Tintagel Crescent
Monday – Friday, evening	14 – Derwent Grove 12 – East Dulwich Road 12 – Ondine Road	15 – Derwent Grove 9 – East Dulwich Road 8 – Tintagel Crescent
Saturday	10 – Derwent Grove 9 – Zenoria Street 8 – East Dulwich Road	11 – Derwent Road 10 – East Dulwich Road 9 – Tintagel Crescent
Sunday	9 – Zenoria Street 7 – East Dulwich Road 6 – Tintagel Crescent	9 – Zenoria Street 6 – Tintagel Crescent 5 – Derwent Grove / East Dulwich Road
Never	17 – Ondine Road 10 – St Francis Road 7 – Grove Vale	14 – Ondine Road 10 – St Francis Road 7 – Copleston Road





Figure 5

Q5) Do you agree with the proposed introduction of a controlled parking zone in your street?

14) The key question of “do you agree with the proposed introduction of a CPZ in your street?” is tabulated for the entire consultation area in Figure 6, graphed in Figure 6.1 and individual responses mapped on a street-by-street bases in Figure 6.2.

Response	Overall total	Percentage
Yes	84	35%
No	143	59%
Undecided	14	6%



Street	Do you agree with the proposed introduction of a CPZ in your street?						Response rate		
	No	No %	Yes	Yes %	Undecided	Undecided %	Total returned	Total delivered	Response rate%
Adys Road	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	2	4	50%
Besant Place	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	2	23	9%
Copleston Road	11	61%	6	33%	1	6%	18	73	25%
Derwent Grove	12	39%	19	61%	0	0%	31	82	38%
Dog Kennel Hill	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	3	0%
East Dulwich Grove	7	58%	2	17%	3	25%	12	86	14%
East Dulwich Road	15	68%	5	23%	2	9%	22	112	20%
Elsie Road	10	50%	7	35%	3	15%	20	41	49%
Grove Vale	14	64%	8	36%	0	0%	22	300	7%
Hayes Grove	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	6	66	9%
Jarvis Road	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	3	0%
Lordship Lane	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1	24	4%
Melbourne Grove	8	47%	7	41%	2	12%	17	86	20%
Oglander Road	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	1	0%
Ondine Road	30	83%	6	17%	0	0%	36	114	32%
Oxonian Street	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	2	10	20%
Railway Rise	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	4	0%
St Francis Road	13	59%	7	32%	2	9%	22	57	39%
Tintagel Crescent	4	31%	8	62%	1	8%	13	35	37%
Tintagel Gardens	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	2	4	50%
Vale End	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	2	0%
Zenoria Street	7	54%	6	46%	0	0%	13	29	45%
GRAND TOTAL	143	59%	84	35%	14	6%	241	1159	21%

Figure 6




Figure 6.1



Figure 6.2

Q6) Would you change your mind if a CPZ was introduced in street next to yours?

15) Those persons who responded that they didn't want or were undecided on a CPZ in their street were asked a further question⁸ if they would change their mind if a CPZ was to be introduced in an adjacent street.

16) Figure 7 details the responses. The majority (61%) would not change their mind and wanted to keep their street uncontrolled even if a CPZ was introduced into an adjacent street.

17) Only East Dulwich Road and Zenoria Street stated that they would change their mind, as shown in Figure 7.1.




Figure 7

Q6	No	Undecided	Yes
East Dulwich Road	7 (41%)	2 (12%)	8 (47%)
Zenoria Street	2 (29%)	2 (29%)	3 (43%)

Figure 7.1

⁸ Those persons completing the paper copy of the questionnaire were able to answer this Q6 even if they had said "yes" to Q5. As their views were not relevant in analysing Q6 we have deleted their responses from the results in this question section.

Q7) Do you agree with the proposed position of the parking bays?

18) An initial design drawing showing the proposed parking layout was provided in the consultation pack and comments were sought from respondents. 48% of those who responded agreed with the parking bay layout and 39% did not.

Q8) Do you agree with the proposed type of parking bays?

19) A further question relating to the detailed design was, “do you agree with the proposed type of parking bay?” 44% of those who responded agreed with design and 45% did not.

Q9) If you answered ‘no’ or ‘undecided’ to Q8 please suggest what type of bay you think there should be more of?

20) Of those who did not agree with the proposed type of parking bays 27 want more short stay ‘free’ bays and 25 wanted more shared use bays. Of note was that 10 respondents to this question considered that more on-street bicycle parking was required. Whilst the initial design did not propose any, this information is valuable to the council for future schemes. Figure 8 details all the responses to this question⁹.




Figure 8

⁹ We have presented all the results to this question including the replies made by those who had said “yes” to question Q8; there were only 5 suggestions made by these people.

Q11) If parking controls were introduced, which of the following options would you prefer?

21) Of the two options being formally consulted upon, the majority (47%) considered the lesser hours (10.00am to 12noon during Monday to Friday) as their preferred choice. 31% selected 8.30am to 6.30pm, Monday to Friday as their preferred choice (Figure 9).




Figure 9

22) Respondents also had opportunity to make an 'alternative suggestion'. Answers provided here ranged from 'no parking controls at all' to requests for Saturday and Sunday controls.

23) Finally, other comments were sought. Understandably, the responses given generally mirrored the view expressed to the key question of whether a CPZ was wanted or not. Figure 10 provides a random selection of comments from those in support of controls. Figure 11 provides a random selection of comments from those against controls. The text positions are indicative of the location the responses originated from.

Supplementary questionnaire on driveway parking

During the consultation period a supplementary questionnaire was hand delivered on 14 October 2011 to 31 properties in Elsie Road and Melbourne Grove. This questionnaire asked recipients, if a CPZ was to be introduced, what parking restrictions they would prefer in front of their driveway. Residents were offered one of the following 2 options:

Option A – Double yellow line across your driveway

If a double yellow line is placed across a driveway, nobody, including the resident or owner of that house, can park across it without risking getting a parking ticket.

Option B – Parking bay and white bar marking across your driveway

If a residents' parking bay is placed across a driveway together with a white bar stretching across the whole driveway (showing that access is needed at all times), the resident or owner of that house or their visitor can park across it without risking getting a parking ticket. But equally, so can any other motorist.

The supplementary questionnaire yielded 14 responses and is summarised in Figure 12

Road	Supplementary questionnaires delivered	Returned	Response rate	Option A (double yellow line)	Option B (Parking bay and white bar)
Melbourne Grove*	11	4	36%	3	0
Elsie Road	20	10	50%	2	8
TOTAL	31	14	45%	5	8

* 1 respondent from Melbourne Grove would prefer a single yellow line across their access

Figure 12

Figure 10 – A random selection of comments made by people who responded in favour of the CPZ (positions are geographically approximate)



Figure 11 – A random selection of comments made by people who responded **against** the CPZ (positions are geographically approximate)



Consultation responses from outside the study area

The consultation yielded 155 responses from residents or businesses from outside the consultation area, responses being received from a total of 52 different streets.

Although the consultation pack was only delivered to those within the consultation boundary, residents and businesses from outside the consultation boundary completed the online questionnaire by selecting 'other' when having to provide their road name then manually entering their street name.

It is assumed that people's awareness to the consultation was via community council, street notices, word of mouth, public exhibitions, the council's consultation webpage and/or the East Dulwich forum.

The key question of "do you agree with the proposed introduction of a CPZ in your street?" showed a majority (No, 136 v Yes, 11) against controls, with 8 responding undecided. This is graphed on a street-by-street basis in figure 13.

Figure 13.1 shows from what streets, the majority of online questionnaire responses came from. It is clear that the listed streets are on the periphery of the study area and are likely to be concerned of any impact a CPZ would have on their street or generally in their neighbourhood. This is reflected in the comments section of the questionnaire by many respondents.

Street	No. of online questionnaire responses
Oglander Road	13
Trossachs Road	11
Melbourne Grove	10
Marsden Road	8
Glengarry road	7
Lordship Lane	7
Muschamp Road	7
Tarbert Road	6
Worlingham Road	6
Ashbourne Grove	5
Tell Grove	5
Abbotswood road	4
Adys Road	4
Copleston Road	4
Nutfield Road	4
Everthorpe Road	3
Matham Grove	3

Figure 13.1

othercontactdetails




Figure 13

questions5

- Yes
- Undecided
- No

Communications made outside of the freepost or online questionnaire

Figure 2 displays the type of communication used by all respondents during consultation.

For the purposes of analysis, the figures used (unless stated otherwise) are based upon actual responses to the questionnaire via the freepost or online address. It is noted that when respondents scanned and emailed their responses to the council these have been included in the main questionnaire dataset.

Whilst inference can be made about the view expressed in an email or letter, for example, the council are unable to add these figures directly into the questionnaire results. This is to encourage people to read the information contained within the consultation pack, respond to specific questions, avoid risk of duplication from those persons who respond by more than one method (by email and questionnaire, for example) and to avoid misinterpretation by the officer inputting the data.

Communications made outside of the questionnaire responses have been included in this study and Figures 14 and summarise the main purpose of the correspondence.

Summary of other correspondence received during the consultation period.

Road	Against a CPZ	Supports a CPZ	Concerned about being excluded from the consultation / knock on	General consultation / CPZ enquiry	Request for a consultation document	Number of individuals contacting the council
ABBOTSWOOD ROAD			1			1
ADYS ROAD	1		1	1		3
BAWDALE ROAD	1		1	3		3
BELLENDEN ROAD			1	2		2
BESANT PLACE				1		1
BUXTED ROAD			1			1
CHESTERFIELD GROVE			1	1		1
CHOUMERT ROAD			1			1
COPLESTON ROAD	2				1	3
CRAWTHEW GROVE			1			1
DERWENT GROVE	1	3				4
ELSIE ROAD		1		6		7
EVERTHORPE ROAD			1			1
FROGLEY ROAD	1					1
GLENGARRY ROAD	1					1
GROVE VALE				1		1
HINCKLEY ROAD			1	2		2
IVANHOE ROAD	1					1
LORDSHIP LANE	1			1		2
MALFORT ROAD	2	1				2
MARSDEN ROAD	11		3			11
MELBOURNE GROVE	2	1	1	5		6
MUSCHAMP ROAD	4		2	1		5
NOT PROVIDED	1		1	3	1	10
NUTFIELD ROAD			1			1
OGLANDER ROAD	12	1	15			21
ONDINE ROAD	4		1	3		6
ST FRANCIS ROAD	2			1		2
TARBERT ROAD	2		2			2
TELL GROVE	1		1			2
TINTAGEL CRESCENT				1	1	3
TROSSACHS ROAD	3		3	2		5
ZENORIA STREET		1				1
Grand Total	53	8	40	34	3	114

Figure 14

Stakeholder communication

Four pieces of correspondence were received from key stakeholders relating to the consultation, this is detailed in figure 15

Key stakeholder	Summary of comments
Southwark Cyclists and Southwark Living Streets (joint reply)	<p><i>Although we are not residents of the area, we represent the interests of many people using the streets in the area on cycles and on foot.</i></p> <p><i>The CPZ regulates inconsiderate use of the kerbside, which helps cyclists and pedestrians.</i></p> <p><i>Any reduction in the practice of commuters leaving their cars near East Dulwich station and commuting onward by train will improve the public realm for local people and reduce pressure on on-street car parking space.</i></p> <p><i>A possible consequence may be that more people will cycle to the station. The capacity of the on-street cycle parking at the station may need to be increased. There appears to be room on the footways for this.</i></p>
Southwark Disability Forum	<p><i>The Local Authority should consider if there are any unintended consequences of any decision for some groups, and second, consider if the policy will be fully effective for all groups. It involves using equality information, and the results of engagement with protected groups and others, to understand the actual effect or the potential effect of Local Authority functions, policies or decisions. It can help the Local Authority to identify practical steps to tackle any negative effects or discrimination, to advance equality and to foster good relations.</i></p>
London Travel Watch	<p><i>The introduction of a scheme may result in displacement of parking onto adjacent bus routes, causing delays to buses and their passengers. Would you please ensure that consideration is given to upgrading parking controls on Grove Vale, an adjacent bus route, so that this possibility is avoided.</i></p>
Goose Green Primary School, Tintagel Crescent	<p><i>A CPZ will not prevent the double parking and short stay parking on the white lines during school drop off and pick up. Therefore the parking problem will not be resolved.</i></p> <p><i>The resident permit will not alleviate the problem outside the school at 8.50-9.00 and 3.15-3.40. We need a defined drop off zone and short term parking.</i></p>

Figure 15

Summary of petitions and informal surveys

Nine petitions / informal parking surveys were received in response to the consultation undertaken in October - November 2011 in relation to the Grove Vale CPZ study, as follows:

- 1) Derwent Grove. An informal parking consultation was carried out by a resident of Derwent Grove. The informal consultation offered 3 options and was signed by 23 residents of Derwent Grove. 18 signatures in favour of controls (14 opted for Mon-Fri, 10.00am -12noon v 4 opted for Mon-Fri 8.30am-6.30pm) and 5 signatures do not support a CPZ.
- 2) Marsden Road, Maxted Road, Ondine Road, Oglander Road, Waghorn Road. A petition collated and submitted by a resident of Marsden Road containing 66 signatures from residents in Ondine Road, Oglander Road, Marsden Road, Maxted Road and Waghorn Road registering their opposition to the proposed CPZ in the area.
- 3) Oglander Road. An informal parking consultation was carried out by a resident in Oglander Road. A total of 23 questionnaires were delivered to Oglander Road residents between Everthorpe Road and Grove Vale.

A majority (17 v 2) are opposed to a CPZ around Grove Vale / East Dulwich Station and all 19 are against the proposed CPZ as it currently stands.

A majority (15 v 2) would like Oglander Road incorporated into the CPZ if the scheme were to go ahead.
- 4) Tell Grove. An informal parking consultation was carried out by a resident of Tell Grove. The question, 'do you want controlled parking?' was a split decision (Yes 9 v No 9). 18 respondents opted for 'yes' when ask 'if a neighbouring street had CPZ, would you want it as well?'
- 5) Wide area. A petition collated and submitted by the South Southwark Business Association, contained 874 resident and amenity user signatures objecting to proposed introduction of a CPZ in and around Grove Vale. The addresses on the petition cover a wide area of Dulwich.
- 6) Wide area. A petition collated and submitted by the South Southwark Business Association, contained 311 business signatures from the area objecting to proposed introduction of a CPZ in and around Grove Vale.
- 7) Hinckley Road, Keston Road and Oglander Road. A petition collated and submitted by a resident of Trossachs Road containing 15 signatures from residents in Hinckley Road, Keston Road and Oglander Road registering their opposition to the proposed CPZ in the area.
- 8) Wide area. A petition collated and submitted by a resident of Trossachs Road containing 381 signatures from residents throughout Dulwich registering their opposition to the proposed CPZ in the area.
- 9) Trossachs Road. An informal parking consultation was carried out by a resident of Trossachs Road. The informal consultation asked if residents were for or against controlled parking on streets near East Dulwich Station. All 148 respondents are against controls.

The petitions have been summarised in figure 16.

Petition ref	Type	Collated by	Date received	Title	For	Against	Petition detail
001	Petition / Informal parking survey	Resident of Derwent Grove	04/11/11	Grove Vale, Controlled Parking Zone study. Petition of support from Derwent Grove Residents	18	5	The 14 Derwent Grove residents in favour opted for Mon-Fri, 10am to 12 noon The 4 Derwent Grove residents in favour opted for Mon – Fri, 8.30am – 6.30pm
002	Petition	Resident of Marsden Road	04/11/11	We, the undersigned, wish to register our opposition to the proposed controlled parking zone in our area		66	Petition signed by residents in Ondine Road, Ogländer Road, Marsden Road, Maxted Road and Waghorn Road
003	Informal parking survey	Resident of Ogländer Road	10/11/11	Proposed Controlled Parking Zone near East Dulwich Station Q1. Are you in favour or opposed to a CPZ around Grove Vale / East Dulwich	2	17	None of the Ogländer Road residents are in favour of the proposed CPZ as it currently stands but 15 would want a opt for a CPZ if the proposal were to go ahead
004	Informal parking survey	Resident of Tell Grove	12/11/11	Residents of Tell Grove – Parking Survey Do you want controlled parking?	9	9	The 18 Tell Grove residents that signed the petition would opt for a CPZ (Mon-Fri, 10am-12noon) if a neighbouring street were to become controlled.
005	Petition	South Southwark Business Association	14/11/11	Residents and Amenity users We the undersigned, object to Southwark Council's proposed introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone in and around Grove Vale as currently being referenced on the council's website. We believe the proposal, if implemented will be detrimental to the local economy and the community as a whole.		874	Petition signed by resident in roads across a broad area in Dulwich, some of the street include: Ashbourne Grove, Barry Road, Copleston Road, Crystal Palace Road, Glengarry Road, Herne Hill, Lordship Lane, Marsden Road, Melbourne Grove, Nutbrook Street, Ogländer Road, Peckham Rye, St Francis Road, Upland Road, Zenoria Street,
006	Petition	South Southwark Business Association	14/11/11	Businesses We the undersigned, object to Southwark Council's proposed introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone in and around Grove Vale as currently being referenced on the council's website. We believe the proposal, if implemented will be detrimental to the local economy and the community as a whole.		311	Signed by businesses in Lordship Lane from the Pellatt Road to the Roundabout, Pellatt Road (2 shops), Grove Vale from the roundabout to Dog Kennel Hill, Dog Kennel Hill - 2 shops before Sainsburys, Melbourne Grove, East Dulwich Grove, East Dulwich Road, North Cross Road, Upland Road, Barry Road (Just the two shops at the junction of Upland Road)
007	Petition		14/11/11	Grove Vale/East Dulwich Station Controlled Parking Zone – October 2011 We the undersigned are opposed to the proposed controlled parking zone as detailed in the consultation document		15	Signed by residents of Hinckley Road, Keston Road and Ogländer Road
008	Petition		14/11/11	We the undersigned resident of East Dulwich oppose the implementation of the planned Controlled Parking Zone in East Dulwich		381	Petition signed by resident in roads across a broad area in Dulwich, some of the street include: Barry Road, Copleston Road, East Dulwich Grove, Glengarry Road, Grove Vale, Melbourne Grove, Muschamp Road Ogländer Road, Tarbert Road, Tell Grove, Trossachs Road
009	Petition / Informal parking survey	Submitted by resident of Trossachs Road	14/11/11	CPZ Petition: Local feeling in ED re proposed CPZ around ED station. Nov 2011 Are you for or against controlled parking on street near ED station? If controlled parking were to happen would you want it to operate mon-fri 8.30-6.30 or 10-12? If controlled parking did happen in a neighbouring street to where you live would you change your mind		148	Petition signed by resident in roads across a broad area in Dulwich, some of the street include: Ashbourne Grove, Chesterfield Grove, Hillsboro Road, Melbourne Grove Lordship Lane, Tarbert Road, Thorncombe Road, Trossachs Road. 8 residents ticked 10-12 as their preferred option 76 resident indicated they would not change their mind a neighbouring street were to become controlled parking.
TOTAL					29	1826	

Figure 16

Section D – Parking stress survey summary

This section provides a summary of the parking survey conducted on a weekday (Thursday 10 February 2011) and a weekend (Saturday 12 and Sunday 13 February 2011).

The beat survey was carried out at every hour from 0600 to 2100. No major public events, school holidays or transport problems were reported on these dates. Full details of the results are set out in appendix 8. The average weekday parking occupancy is mapped in figure 17.

The parking beat data was collected on a space by space basis with the exact location, any vehicle permit types shown, the vehicle type and the parking restriction type (if any) for each being recorded. Each space was 5.0 meters long was given a unique reference number.

The whole survey area was surveyed between 0600 and 2100 with a 30 minute frequency. The first beat in reality starts at 0500 and the last finished at 2200.

The surveys results display occupancy compared to capacity, length of vehicle stay and parking demand type for each street.

Headline results

- 1) Eight roads demonstrated a very high (>80%) average occupancy on the weekday survey. The average occupancy across the study area was 73%. Eight roads during the day, showed over saturation (>100%) at some point on the weekday survey indicating parking was occurring in unsafe locations (on road junctions or yellow lines) or in obstructive locations (across dropped kerbs or double parking).
- 2) The highest level of occupancy (134%) was recorded at 0830 in Elsie Road.
- 3) The lowest level of occupancy (0%) was recorded in Hayes Grove.
- 4) Between 0730-1830 there was an average of 20% “commuters” or “non residents” vehicles parked in the study area.
- 5) The highest number of “commuter” vehicles were parked in St Francis Road (21, 38% of all cars parked), Melbourne Grove (16, 21%) Derwent Grove (15, 20%), Elsie Road (11, 22%), and Ondine Road (10, 9%).
- 6) Over the 3 days the survey revealed that there was an average of 475 resident vehicles parked in the study area at 0600. This gives us an indication of the number of resident vehicles in the study area.
- 7) At the weekend average occupancy was lower and fell to to 68% (Saturday) and 63% (Sunday).

Please note: There was a data capture error in Zenoria Street on the Sunday survey. The title 'Oglander Road (Copleston Road)' applies to Copleston Road only. Vale End results include that area named on-street as Hayes Grove. Hayes Grove in the survey results only applies to that area between Oglander and the “Y” junction of Hayes Grove. East Dulwich Road survey only identifies 29 safe parking spaces, which the council disagrees with. It would appear that the surveyors counted only 29 spaces in the street and surveyed those same 29 spaces as the actually occupancy/duration results are not dissimilar as to that which we would expect.

Parking occupancy map

The average weekday parking occupancy in the Grove Vale study area




Figure 17

Section E – Grove Vale CPZ parking demand and initial design


This section compares the existing parking demand compared to the CPZ initial design.

Parking demand

We have determined that there are approximately 475 resident vehicles in the study area. This is an average of vehicles parked at 6.00am over the 3 parking occupancy survey dates. Vehicles parked at 6.00am are classified as resident for the purposes of the survey. For example, on each of the three survey days, 62 vehicles were parked in Derwent Grove at 6.00am.

The Office of National Statistics's Publications Hub provides a variety of UK datasets. It allows users to define their own regions (rather than political boundaries) for analysis purposes. We have attempted to do this for the Grove Vale study area in relation to Key Statistic (KS17) which provides 2001 Census data on the number of private cars or vans owned. User defined regions are limited by post code boundaries so we cannot provide an accurate ONS figure for the area, as the defined region includes some streets not in the consultation area, such as Everthorpe Road and Oglander Road and excludes part of Ondine Road. However, taking into account the limitations the ONS figure for KS17 the approximate GV study area shows 635 private cars and vans owned.

An alternative method to the census is use of Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (DVLA) data (figure X). This, however, cannot be refined beyond a ward level. The DVLA figures show 3260 (licensed at end of 2010) cars registered in East Dulwich and 2577 in South Camberwell.



When considering the DVLA and Census figures it must be borne in mind that the census is self reporting (people may say they have access to a car when the vehicle may be registered at an address outside the borough or unregistered) while car ownership data (DVLA) is for those registered within the area (in the above case by ward). It should be noted that the census data is 10 years old.

Our parking surveys identified that there were 100 commuters and 27 non residents parking in the study area on a weekday. These are the total of number commuters / non residents parked at 11am during the weekday survey. We chose the 11am figures as this would be during the proposed 2 hour controlled period.

Initial CPZ design

There are a variety of methods to quantifying how many spaces a CPZ will create. This is because vehicle lengths vary in size (eg a Mini is ~3.3m and a Mondeo ~4.8m). Furthermore, the council do not paint the parking bays into individual spaces, rather they will be long parking places holding as many vehicles as the motorists can choose to fit. We consider long, undesignated parking places to be the most efficient use of allocated parking space.

Generally, it is practice to sum the length of parking bays and divide by a nominal length, the parking industry often¹⁰ uses 5.0m (5.0 was the value used in this report's parking occupancy survey). However this method does have limitations, particularly that the sum of two entirely separate parking bays each of 8m would give a total parking supply of 16m, dividing this by 5m would suggest there was room for 3 cars. However, in reality, a single 8m bay will usually only hold one car. This lower capacity figure is, of course, dependant upon vehicle size and the motorist's ability or decision of how to park. Therefore, in this example the real-world situation would be a supply of 2 and not 3 as the sum / nominal value would have suggested.

An exercise has therefore been carried out that provides a comparison between the existing number of spaces within the GV consultation area and the number that have been proposed as available for permit holders within the initial CPZ design distributed for public consultation.

The values shown in figure 18 provide the net loss/gain of parking on a street-by-street basis and a summary of reason for that change. This is mapped in Appendix 9.

The calculations used provide a 'real-world' set of values (discussed above) instead of the more arithmetic approach used, where the proposed bay lengths were divided by 5.0, irrespective of the number of cars you could actually fit in each bay. Both methods are robust and useful but do provide slightly different results.

¹⁰ Eg. London Parking Supply Study, MVA for TFL, 2005

ROAD	EXISTING NUMBER OF SPACES AVAILABLE (PRE CPZ) (5M SPACE)	PROPOSED NUMBER OF SPACES AVAILABLE FOR PERMIT HOLDERS (POST CPZ) (5M SPACE)	CHANGE IN PARKING SPACE	REASON FOR LOSS / GAIN IN PARKING SPACES
DERWENT GROVE	70	68	-2	Due to providing a time restricted free bay at the Grove Vale Junction
EAST DULWICH RD.	42	42	-	No change
ELSIE ROAD	54	55	+1	Additional space created
GROVE VALE	0	9	+9	New spaces created as part of the Grove Vale project
JARVIS RD	7	7	-	No change
MELBOURNE GROVE	35	37	+2	x2 spaces created outside 17/19
COPELESTON ROAD	48	48	-	No change
ONDINE RD.	102	100	-1	Due to providing time restricted free bay at the Grove Vale junction
OXONIAN STREET	19	18	-1	Installation of DYL on 90 degree bend
ST.FRANCIS RD	51	44	-7	Due to installation of DYL in turning circle area and providing time restricted free bays at the Grove Vale junction
TINTAGEL CRESCENT	47	44	-3	Due to providing a time restricted free bay at the Lordship Lane Junction
ZENORIA STREET	23	21	-2	Due to the extension of the loading bay
TOTAL	498	493	-5	

Figure 18

Conclusion (parking demand v initial design)

The 06.00 survey identifies that there are approximately 475 resident vehicles in the study area.

This figure can fall by 20% during the day (when the CPZ would be operational) with resident vehicles departing from the area to be replaced by others and thus maintaining, at present, relatively even levels of occupancy.

The survey identified that during the week 100 commuters (parked for >6 hours) and 27 non residents (parked for 3-6 hours) are parked in the study area on a weekday.

Although the surveys are only a snapshot of the parking activity, this indicates that currently during the day the parking can potentially be overcapacity in the study area but that the proposed supply of spaces for residents would be greater than the total number of residents wanting to park.

As shown in Figure 18 above, the initial design provides for 493 spaces that permit holders could park in during CPZ hours. It should be noted that 493 increases by 38 spaces after the controlled hours finish. This would provide extra space for residents (or anyone to park) in the short term parking bays (Derwent Grove, Grove Vale, Melbourne Grove, Ondine Road, St Francis Road, Tintagel Crescent, Vale End and Zenoria Street) and on single yellow lines (Melbourne Grove and Grove Vale).

Section F – Study conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions

Parking controls continue to provide varied and polarised opinion. The perception on whether or not controls are required will depend on personal factors as well as the local conditions on-street.

It should also be noted that self-selection bias may occur in a study where potential respondents have control over whether they participate.

Typically when respondents are volunteers, people with strong opinions or substantial knowledge are more likely to reply, potentially making the sample non-representative of the general population. As the public response to a consultation is through self-administered surveys, there is no control over those who choose to fill out the questionnaire.

Inferential statistical methods rest on the assumption that the results from a small sample can be generalised to the population from which it was drawn. As feedback received tends to be a non-probabilistic sample, the statistical significance of our results (either in favour or against the proposals) has not been, nor should it be, extrapolated across all stakeholders. We can only be certain that the consultation feedback received is representative of those who chose to respond.

Consideration has been given to those views expressed by alternative methods to the questionnaire and also to views expressed via the questionnaire received from people outside the study area. Whilst they have not been added to the results for reasons discussed on page (28) it was important to check that there was no significant contrast of opinion between questionnaire responses and emailed comments.

Consultation results show a clear correlation between support for the CPZ and perceived easy/difficulty in parking. Those supporting the introduction of a CPZ report difficulty parking in their street, 79% of CPZ supporters said that they found parking difficult (≥ 4 on scale of 1(easy) to 5(difficult)). The converse is equally true and those against the introduction of a CPZ who reported little difficulty parking in their street. 62% of those against the CPZ found parking easy (≤ 2 on scale of 1(easy) to 5(difficult)).

Each individual response was mapped in GIS which provided opportunity to look for patterns beyond that displayed on a street level.

The results from the consultation show that, overall, there is no clear majority in favour of parking controls across the entire consultation area. There are some streets in favour that merit further consideration, for example, Derwent Grove and Tintagel Crescent. Zenoria Road and East Dulwich Road both responded that they would “change their mind” if a CPZ was introduced in an adjacent street.

There is also a grouping of support, as a smaller zone, in the area bounded by Grove Vale and East Dulwich Grove.

A range of possible options are outlined in Figure 19.

Further conclusions on a street-by-street basis, based upon the initial design

Street	Highlight of issues raised and officer observations
Adys Road (part)	The initial design had no changes proposed for this road The road is included in this analysis as two corner properties (flank walls in Ondine Road) were consulted
Besant Place	These properties are within the initial zone boundary and would be entitled to permits Public highway and private road ownership varies in this street Some properties have off-street (private) car parks. There is also a (private) permit scheme in operation on the private stretch of this road to protect residents interests Some frontages lead onto the public highway where parking bays were proposed wherever safe
Copleston Road (part)	Clear majority against CPZ Review of existing disabled bays required
Derwent Grove	Majority of residents in favour of CPZ. No off-street parking There is particularly strong support for controls from residents closer to Grove Vale
Dog Kennel Hill (part)	No response from 3 properties consulted Existing restrictions prevent parking 24/7
East Dulwich Grove (part)	The northern side of this road was included within the consultation Existing restrictions prevent parking 24/7 Residents with vehicles are therefore likely to park in side roads, within and outside of the initial zone boundary
East Dulwich Road (part)	Majority against a CPZ A majority of those who responded 'no' or 'undecided' to wanting a CPZ would, in fact, change their mind if a CPZ was introduced in a neighboring street Parking is already formalised, following changes implemented to ensure Fire Brigade access. Concerns raised about how the parking arrangements reduced parking capacity
Elsie Road	Mixed views on CPZ Many properties have off-street parking Majority of residents supported bays in front of driveways Road is sandwiched between two streets that support the CPZ No majority to indicate they would change their mind if introduced on an adjacent road Needs double yellow lines at junction with Tintagel Crescent
Grove Vale	Existing restrictions prevent parking during peak hours, with stretches 24/7. Frontages include numerous shops, cafés, a PH and a library Existing provision of short-stay visitor parking
Hayes Grove	Public highway and private road ownership varies in this street Some properties have off-street (private) car parks. There is also a (private) permit scheme in operation on the private stretch of this road to protect residents interests Some frontages lead onto the public highway where parking bays were proposed wherever safe
Jarvis Road	No response from 3 properties consulted There are two existing doctors bays that are not signed and create ambiguity about whether parking is permitted or not
Lordship Lane (part)	The initial design had no changes proposed for this road Only a small section of Lordship Lane was consulted, the properties between Zenoria Street and East Dulwich Grove These properties are within the initial zone boundary and would be entitled to permits
Melbourne Grove (part)	Analysis show that a majority of residents in the section Melbourne Grove support parking controls. Businesses in the street have existing 30min and 3hr parking bays to prioritise space for customers. Businesses raised concern about staff parking but recognised high demand for parking space and that their staff regularly had to park further away Opportunity to provide additional short-stay and destination disabled parking. Majority of residents do not support bays in front of driveways

Street	Highlight of issues raised and officer observations
Oglander Road	<p>The initial design had no changes proposed for this road</p> <p>The road is included in this analysis as one corner properties (flank walls of Copleston Road) was consulted</p> <p>This property was within the initial zone boundary and would be entitled to permits</p>
Ondine Road	<p>Clear majority against CPZ</p> <p>Where there is support, this is nearer to Grove Vale.</p>
Oxonian Street	<p>Majority of residents against CPZ.</p> <p>Oxonian Street and Zenoria Street are connected and, for the purposes of any CPZ, should be considered as one.</p> <p>Needs double yellow lines at 90⁰ bend with Zenoria Street as route restricted.</p>
Railway Rise	<p>The initial design had no changes proposed for this road</p> <p>This road is not public highway therefore a CPZ would not apply</p>
St Francis Road	<p>Majority of resident against CPZ</p> <p>Analysis show those in favour are closer to the junction with Grove Vale / Dog Kennel Hill</p> <p>Opportunity to provide short stay parking bays for adjacent businesses</p>
Tintagel Crescent	<p>Majority of residents in favour of CPZ</p> <p>No off-street parking</p> <p>Analysis of the comments section of the questionnaire identifies that there is a particular problem during the school drop off/pick up time</p> <p>Needs double yellow lines at junction with Elsie Road</p>
Tintagel Gardens	<p>The initial design had no changes proposed for this road as it is not public highway</p> <p>Residents are likely to park in Oxonian Street or Zenoria Street.</p>
Vale End	<p>Some properties have off-street (private) car parks. There is also a (private) permit scheme in operation on the private stretch of this road to protect residents interests</p> <p>Opportunity to provide short stay parking bay for adjacent businesses</p>
Zenoria Street	<p>Majority against a CPZ</p> <p>A majority of those who responded 'no' or 'undecided' to wanting a CPZ would, in fact, change their mind if a CPZ was introduced in a neighboring street</p> <p>Zenoria Street and Oxonian Street are connected and, for the purposes of any CPZ, should be considered as one.</p> <p>Needs double yellow lines at 90⁰ bend with Oxonian Street as route restricted</p> <p>Significant congestion at junction with Lordship Lane</p> <p>Existing parking restrictions (loading/free) ambiguous and should be clarified</p>

Grove Vale study area options

Option	Recommendations	Rationale	Risks	Benefits
1	Not to proceed with the installation of a CPZ in any of the Grove Vale study area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall majority against parking controls in the study area Petitions received indicate that the wider community doesn't want controls in the area 	<p>This will not address the parking difficulties currently being experienced (and shown) in some streets in the area and will not respond to those residents who took part in the consultation and supported the scheme.</p> <p>Installing double yellow lines on junctions could displace some vehicles (ie further increase parking pressure)</p>	<p>Is in line with the overall response from the consultation.</p> <p>Is in line with the majority of views independently expressed by the wider community.</p>
2	<p>Not to proceed with the installation of a CPZ in any of the Grove Vale study area but carry out minor changes, eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimise restrictions, declutter and refresh existing signs wherever possible Install yellow lines on unrestricted junctions where currently absent Remove unused doctors bays in Jarvis Road & motorcycle bay in Derwent Grove Install x2 destination disabled bays in Melbourne Grove and extend the time restricted free bay 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall majority against parking controls in the study area Petitions received indicate that the wider community doesn't want controls in the area Recognition of high parking demand leading to obstructive parking in some locations Opportunity to create more spaces where parking demand is high. Improve legibility of existing restrictions to motorists 	<p>Vehicle access will improve for the London Fire Brigade</p> <p>Improved public realm</p> <p>Clarity of restrictions to motorists</p>	
3	To introduce a one hour CPZ on an experimental basis in Derwent Grove only	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A majority 61% of residents in favour of a CPZ in Derwent Grove A petition received in support of a CPZ from resident in Derwent Grove 8 independent CPZ requests received from Derwent Grove A clear cluster of support for controls in the northern section of Derwent Grove Majority of resident indicated that parking is a problem Monday – Friday, daytime. Parking surveys revealed that there were 16 commuter vehicles parked during the weekday survey 	<p>The scheme may cause displacement to roads on the periphery of the proposed area which could trigger the need for further consultation and funding.</p> <p>The council has never installed an isolated one-street CPZ before. This could set a difficult precedent in other parts of the borough.</p>	<p>Will address the parking problems in Derwent Grove.</p> <p>Supports the majority of those responding to the consultation in Derwent Grove.</p>

Figure 19

Option	Recommendations	Rationale	Risks	Benefits																																				
4	<p>To introduce a one hour CPZ on an experimental basis in the following streets only: Derwent Grove, Elsie Road, Jarvis Road, Melbourne Grove, Oxonian Street, Tintagel Crescent and Zenoria Street.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response to the question "Do you agree with the proposed introduction of a controlled parking zone in your street?": <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Street</th> <th>Yes</th> <th>No</th> <th>Undecided</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Derwent Grove</td> <td>19</td> <td>12</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Elsie Road</td> <td>7</td> <td>10</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Melbourne Grove</td> <td>7</td> <td>8</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Oxonian Street</td> <td></td> <td>2</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tintagel Crescent</td> <td>8</td> <td>4</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tintagel Gardens</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zenoria Street</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>48</td> <td>44</td> <td>6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 49% supports parking controls in these streets and 45% do not. 6% were undecided. Therefore of those who expressed a definite view, a majority were in favour Clear majority in favour in Derwent Grove and Tintagel Crescent Melbourne Grove, when analysing the responses the majority of residents in Melbourne Grove, support a CPZ. Three replies from businesses do not support 77 commuter / non residents, identified parking in these street at 1.00am on the weekday parking survey 	Street	Yes	No	Undecided	Derwent Grove	19	12		Elsie Road	7	10	3	Melbourne Grove	7	8	2	Oxonian Street		2		Tintagel Crescent	8	4	1	Tintagel Gardens	1	1		Zenoria Street	6	7		TOTAL	48	44	6	<p>The scheme may cause displacement to roads on the periphery of the proposed area which could trigger the need for further consultation and funding.</p>	<p>Will address the parking problems in these streets.</p> <p>Provides a logical CPZ boundary.</p> <p>Can be monitored over an 18 month trial period. Can be removed if unsuccessful.</p> <p>A 1 hour CPZ would be sufficient time for enforcement purposes within this small group of streets</p> <p>Businesses already have space prioritised for their customers and additional spaces will be created.</p>
Street	Yes	No	Undecided																																					
Derwent Grove	19	12																																						
Elsie Road	7	10	3																																					
Melbourne Grove	7	8	2																																					
Oxonian Street		2																																						
Tintagel Crescent	8	4	1																																					
Tintagel Gardens	1	1																																						
Zenoria Street	6	7																																						
TOTAL	48	44	6																																					
5	<p>To introduce a one hour CPZ on an experimental basis in the following streets only: Derwent Grove, Elsie Road and Tintagel Crescent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response to the question "Do you agree with the proposed introduction of a controlled parking zone in your street?": <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Street</th> <th>Yes</th> <th>No</th> <th>Undecided</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Derwent Grove</td> <td>19</td> <td>12</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Elsie Road</td> <td>7</td> <td>10</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tintagel Crescent</td> <td>8</td> <td>4</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>34</td> <td>26</td> <td>4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 53% supports parking controls in these streets and 41% do not. 6% were undecided. Therefore a majority in favour of a CPZ in these streets It would be appropriate to consider Tintagel Crescent and Elsie Road together due to their physical connection 	Street	Yes	No	Undecided	Derwent Grove	19	12		Elsie Road	7	10	3	Tintagel Crescent	8	4	1	TOTAL	34	26	4	<p>The scheme may cause displacement to roads on the periphery of the proposed area which could trigger the need for further consultation and funding.</p> <p>Elsie Road responded 'no' to the question "would you change your mind if a CPZ was introduced in a street next to yours?"</p>	<p>Will address the parking problems in these streets.</p> <p>Would mean that Elsie Road is not 'sandwiched' between two streets where there is support for a CPZ.</p>																
Street	Yes	No	Undecided																																					
Derwent Grove	19	12																																						
Elsie Road	7	10	3																																					
Tintagel Crescent	8	4	1																																					
TOTAL	34	26	4																																					

Figure 19

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. The options outlined in the preceding section are discussed at both Camberwell and Dulwich community council in January 2012.
2. That formal comment is sought from both community councils on those options.
3. That a key decision IDM be prepared that summarises the content of this report and to include those comments received by both community councils, this will be a decision taken by the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Recycling in February 2012.

List of figures

Figure	Title
Figure 1	<i>1st and 2nd stage CPZ process</i>
Figure 2 and 2.1	<i>Table and Graph – Grove Vale consultation response rate</i>
Figure 3	<i>Graph – (How many vehicles do you park on Street?)</i>
Figure 4	<i>Graph – (The ability to find an on-street parking space)</i>
Figure 5	<i>Graph – (What time of day have difficulty parking)</i>
Figure 6, 6.1 and 6.2	<i>Graph – (Do you agree with the proposed introduction of a CPZ in your street?)</i>
Figure 7 and 7.1	<i>Graph – (Would you change your mind if a CPZ was introduced in street next to yours?)</i>
Figure 8	<i>Graph – (What type of bay you think there should be more of?)</i>
Figure 9	<i>Graph – (if parking controls were introduced, which controlled times would you prefer?)</i>
Figure 10	<i>Map – Selection of Yes comments</i>
Figure 11	<i>Map – Selection of No comments</i>
Figure 12	<i>Table – Supplementary questionnaire responses</i>
Figure 13 and 13.1	<i>Table and Graph - Consultation responses from outside the study area</i>
Figure 14	<i>Table – Communication from outside the study area</i>
Figure 15	<i>Table – Stakeholder comments</i>
Figure 16	<i>Table – Summary of petitions</i>
Figure 17	<i>Map – Vehicle occupancy</i>
Figure 18	<i>Map – Pre and Post CPZ parking spaces</i>
Figure 19	<i>Map – Recommendations</i>

List of appendices

Appendix	Title
Appendix 1	<i>Map of existing Southwark CPZs</i>
Appendix 2	<i>Existing controls within the Grove Vale study area</i>
Appendix 3	<i>Grove Vale 1st and 2nd stage consultation document</i>
Appendix 4	<i>Grove Vale consultation street notices locations</i>
Appendix 5	<i>Grove Vale consultation street notice</i>
Appendix 6	<i>Parking beat surveys (Summarised)</i>
Appendix 7	<i>OS land use map</i>
Appendix 8	<i>Parking beat surveys (Detailed)</i>
Appendix 9	<i>Pre and post CPZ spaces</i>
Appendix 10	<i>Consultation questionnaire responses – raw data</i>

Version control

Version 1.0 Draft

Author: Paul Gellard

Checked by: Tim Walker

Approved by: Matt Hill

Agenda Item 11

COMMUNITY COUNCILS
A voice for your community



Dulwich Community Council

Soap box session question form

Your name:

Your mailing address:

What is your question?

Please give questions to Beverley Olamijulo, Constitutional Officer, or Abdi Mohamed Ibrahim, Neighbourhood Coordinator or the Community Council Development Officer.

Item No. 12.	Classification: Open	Date: 24 January 2012	Meeting Name: Dulwich Community Council
Report title:		Local Parking Amendments	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All wards with Dulwich Community Council	
From:		Head of Public Realm	

RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that the following local parking amendments, detailed in the appendices to this report, are approved for implementation subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory procedures:
 - Colby Road – Install one disabled persons (blue badge) parking bay
 - Melbourne Grove – Install one disabled persons (blue badge) parking bay
 - East Dulwich Grove - Install one disabled persons (blue badge) parking bay
 - Alleyn Park – Install ‘at any time’ waiting restrictions
 - Dulwich Wood Avenue - Reduce existing “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) at the junction with Dulwich Wood Park
 - Stradella Road - Remove bay markings and install single yellow line to provide access to No12 by recently installed dropped kerb

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. This report presents proposals for a number of local parking amendments, which are reserved to the Community Council for decision under Part 3H of the constitution.
3. The origins and reasons for the proposals are discussed in the main body of the report.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Origin disabled bays – Ansdell Road, Maxted Road, Kirkwood Road and Goodrich Road

4. Two applications have been received by the network operations team for the installation of a disabled persons (blue badge) parking bay. In each case, the applicant met the necessary criteria for an origin, disabled persons parking bay.
5. The parking design team has subsequently carried out a site visit to evaluate the road network and carried out consultation with each applicant to ascertain the appropriate location for each disabled bay.

6. It is therefore recommended that disabled bays be installed at the following locations, see appendices for detailed design:

Reference	Bay location (approx)	Drawing appendix number
1112Q3006	Outside 22 Colby Road	Appendix 1
1112Q3013	Outside 92 Melbourne Grove	Appendix 2

Alleyn Park – proposed at any time waiting restrictions

7. The parking design team received a letter from Cllr Robinson on 6 October 2011 regarding parking in a section of Alleyn Park which is the private carriageway access to properties 48-58 Alleyn Park.
8. Cllr Robinson contacted the parking design team on behalf of a constituent who raised concerns about cars parking in Alleyn Park close to the access junction to numbers 48-58, making it very difficult for motorists to see oncoming traffic.
9. At present, there is a white access bar marking (known as an H-bar) across the access. They are generally installed to indicate the presence of a dropped kerb (leading to a private driveway). They have no legal significance, unlike a yellow line where a PCN (also known as a parking ticket) may be issued.
10. As the existing marking is only advisory, it is apparent that motorists are ignoring the restrictions and causing obstruction.

Recommendation

11. The parking design team has carried out a site inspection at this junction, although no vehicles were parked at the time of the site visit, a resident has provided photos which show there is a regular problem with parking, particularly during the school drop off / pick up periods. For this reason it is proposed to install 'at any time' waiting restrictions to ensure vehicular access is maintained at all times (Appendix 3).

Dulwich Wood Avenue – Reduce existing “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) at the junction with Dulwich Wood Park

12. This is a returning item that was previously reported to Dulwich Community Council on 7 November 2011 but a decision of which was deferred.
13. The parking design team was asked by a local resident to investigate the possibility of reducing the “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on the junction with Dulwich Wood Park.
14. An officer from the parking design team evaluated the junction and it is felt that reducing the existing double yellow lines allow more parking and would not compromise sight lines or junction safety.
15. It is recommended, as shown in Appendix 4, that “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) are modified in length.

Stradella Road – Remove bay markings and install single yellow line to provide access to No12 by recently installed dropped kerb

16. This is a returning item that was previously reported to Dulwich Community Council on 7 November 2011 but a decision of which was deferred.
17. The council's asset management team have received, considered and approved in principal (subject to this decision and statutory consultation) the construction of a vehicle crossover leading to No. 12 Stradella Road.
18. The proposed crossover location currently has a shared-use parking bay in front of it, this bay is part of Herne Hill (HH) Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).
19. It is not possible to maintain a parking bay and dropped kerb at the same location as the presence of both would provide a conflicting message to motorists.
20. The parking design team has been asked by asset management to progress a local parking amendment such that the parking bay is removed and a waiting restriction installed; this will result in the loss of approximately 1 parking space.
21. It is noted that the planning department has granted planning permission for the works.
22. It is recommended, as shown in Appendix 5 that the bay marking outside No.12 is removed and 5 metres of single yellow line is installed.

Policy implications

23. The recommendation contained within this report is consistent with the policies of the Parking Enforcement Plan and the Transport Plan 2011.
24. The proposal(s) will support the council's equalities and human rights policies and will promote social inclusion by:
 - Providing improved access for emergency vehicles, refuge vehicles, residents and visitors
 - Provide origin disabled bays to assist residents with mobility impairments

Community impact statement

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

Resource implications

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

Consultation

27. No informal (public) consultation has been carried out. Where consultation with stakeholders has been completed, this is described within the main body of the report.

28. Should the community council approve the item(s), statutory consultation will take place as part of the making of the traffic management order. A proposal notice will be erected in proximity to the site location and a press notice will be published in the Southwark News and London Gazette. If there are objections a further report will be re-submitted to the community council for determination.
29. The road network and parking manager has been consulted on the proposals and has no objections.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Parking and Enforcement Plan	Public Realm Environment and Leisure 160 Tooley Street London SE1P 5LX	Tim Walker 020 7525 2021




APPENDICES


No.	Title
Appendix 1	Proposed disabled bay outside 22 Colby Road
Appendix 2	Proposed disabled bay outside 92 Melbourne Grove
Appendix 3	Alleyn Park – proposed ‘at any time waiting restrictions
Appendix 4	Dulwich Wood Avenue – Reduce existing “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) at the junction with Dulwich Wood Park
Appendix 5	Stradella Road – Remove bay markings and install single yellow line to provide access to No12 by recently installed dropped kerb

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Tim Walker, Senior Engineer	
Report Author	Paul Gellard, Transport and Projects Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	21 December 2011	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director for Communities, Law & Governance	No	No
Finance Director	No	No
Parking operations and development manager	No	No
Network manager	No	No
Parking and network management business unit manager	Yes	No
Cabinet Member	No	No
Date final report sent to the Constitutional Team	21 December 2011	


Appendix 1

<p>Public Realm Projects</p>  <p>Southwark Council Environment and Leisure, Public Realm PO Box 64529, London SE1 5LX</p>																																																													
<p>LEGEND</p>																																																													
 <p>Proposed disabled bay markings</p>	 <p>Disabled bay sign and post</p>																																																												
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;">Revision details</th> <th style="width: 25%;">By</th> <th style="width: 25%;">Date</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Suffix</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td><td> </td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Revision details	By	Date	Suffix																																													<p>Project ID / name 1112_LPA_Q3</p> <p>Drawing title Proposed origin disabled bay Colby Road Layout</p> <p>Detailed design</p> <p>Scale 1:500 A4</p> <p>File name Q3_LPA_DPPP_V2.dwg</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 25%;">Drawn</th> <th style="width: 25%;">Designed</th> <th style="width: 25%;">Checked</th> <th style="width: 25%;">Approved</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PG</td> <td>PG</td> <td>TW</td> <td>TW</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NOV 11</td> <td>NOV 11</td> <td>NOV 11</td> <td>NOV 11</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="font-size: small;">© Crown copyright. All rights reserved ((0)100019252) 2011</p>	Drawn	Designed	Checked	Approved	PG	PG	TW	TW	NOV 11	NOV 11	NOV 11	NOV 11
Revision details	By	Date	Suffix																																																										
Drawn	Designed	Checked	Approved																																																										
PG	PG	TW	TW																																																										
NOV 11	NOV 11	NOV 11	NOV 11																																																										




Appendix 2

Public Realm Projects




Southwark Council
Environment and Leisure, Public Realm
PO Box 64529, London SE1 5LX

LEGEND



Proposed disabled bay markings




Disabled bay sign and post

Revision details	By	Date	Suffix

Project ID / name	1112_LPA_Q3
Drawing title	Proposed origin disabled bay Melbourne Grove Layout
Detailed design	
Scale	1:500 A4
File name	Q3_LPA_DPPP_V2.dwg


Drawn	Designed	Checked	Approved
PG	PG	TW	TW
NOV 11	NOV 11	NOV 11	NOV 11

© Crown copyright. All rights reserved (0)100019252) 2011



Appendix 3

NETWORK DEVELOPMENT



Environment & Housing Dept. Public Realm Division
PO Box 64529, London SE1 5LX

LEGEND

- Existing at any time waiting restrictions
- Proposed at any time waiting restrictions

Revision details	By	Date	Suffix
			A
			B

Project Number
1112Q3_LOCAL_PARKING_AMENDMENTS

Title
ALLEYN PARK
PROPOSED_AAT_WAITING_RESTRICTIONS
Layout

DETAILED DESIGN

Scale
1:500

File Name
1112Q3


Drawn	Designed	Checked	Approved
PG	PG	TW	TW
DEC 11	DEC 11	DEC 11	DEC 11

© Crown copyright. All rights reserved. (0100019252) 2010






Appendix 4

NETWORK DEVELOPMENT



Environment & Housing Dept., Public Realm Division
PO Box 64529, London SE1 15LX

LEGEND

-  Existing Double yellow lines
-  Removal of Double yellow lines
-  Existing Bus Stop

Revision details	By	Date	Suffix
			A
			B

Project Number
1112Q2_LOCAL_PARKING_AMENDMENTS

Title
DULWICH_WOOD_AVENUE
REMOVAL_OF_AAT_WAITING_RESTRICTIONS


Layout
DETAILED_DESIGN

Scale
1:500

File Name
1112Q2_002


Drawn	Designed	Checked	Approved
MH	MH	TW	TW
13/09/11	13/09/11	13/09/11	13/09/11

© Crown copyright. All rights reserved. (01)10019252/2010



Appendix 5

NETWORK DEVELOPMENT



Environment, Public Realm
PO Box 64529, London SE1 5LX

LEGEND

- WAITING RESTRICTION (at Any Time)
- LOADING BAY
- 30min FREE BAY
- PERMIT HOLDER ONLY BAY
- 2 HOUR METER
- 4HR SHARED USE BAY
- DOCTOR PARKING BAY
- DISABLED BAY
- MOTORCYCLE BAY

Revision details	By	Date	Suffix
			A
			B

Project ID / name
1112Q2_LOCAL_PARKING_AMENDMENTS

Drawing title
STRADELLA ROAD
PROPOSED_AAT_WAITING_RESTRICTIONS


Layout
DETAILED_DESIGN

Scale
1:200_AT_A4

File name
1112Q2020

Drawn	Designed	Checked	Approved
MH	MH	TW	CJ
18/08/11	18/08/11	18/08/11	19/08/11

© Crown copyright. All rights reserved (0100019252) 2011



Item No. 13.	Classification: Open	Date: 24 January 2012	Meeting Name: Dulwich Community Council
Report title:		Community Councils Highways and Lighting Capital Investment 2012 – 13	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		All in the Dulwich Community Council Area	
From:		Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure	

RECOMMENDATION

1. To agree the works to be funded from the proposed schemes in the Dulwich community council area as set out in appendix A.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. The declining quality of public highway coupled with extreme weather events has led to further deterioration – with some non principal, unclassified roads being particularly affected. Given the nature of these roads and the lower level of traffic flows it is unlikely that such locations will feature in any major resurfacing programme. Without the necessary capital allocation to attend to such locations, complaints of poor road surfaces can only be dealt with through the reactive maintenance programme.
3. As part of the approved Highways capital investment programme for 2011 - 2012 a significant proportion has been devolved to each community council area
4. Each Community Council will receive £100,000 for highways surface improvements and £75,000 for Lighting improvements of their choice

KEY ISSUES FOR

CONSIDERATION Engineers

selections

5. As an aid to the selection process relevant engineers have provided a range of required works and indicative costs for their implementation (Appendix 1).
6. Appendix 2 provides information of schemes proposed for consideration following a walkabout on 11 January 2012 between Village Ward councilors and highway's engineers.
7. Further direction is being sought for a walkabout with the other affected wards to identify or investigate any new proposals. Any further information will be circulated at the Dulwich Community Council meeting on 24 January 2012.
8. In addition to the resurfacing selections provided it has been agreed and authorised that it could appropriate to spend the surfacing money on minor patching and pothole repairs should a Community Council wish to do so.

Community council selections

9. This money can be spent on any asset renewal or replacement project selected by the Community Council with the caveats that it cannot be spent on traffic safety or parking schemes, non functional or decorative installations and / or non-essential works.

Delivery

10. Once the Community Council has made their selections by the method of their choice the Public Realm Projects Team will design and deliver the works as soon as possible.

Community impact statement

11. There are no specific community impact issues arising from the recommendations.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Highways Capital Investment Programme Decision 29/03/2010	160 Tooley Street PO Box 64529 Southwark Council London SE1P 5LX	Matt Hill Environment and Leisure 020 7525 3541

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Dulwich Community Council - Candidate Schemes
Appendix 2	Village Ward – Candidate Proposals by ward Councillors
Appendix 3	Devolved DCC Funded Schemes - Update on previously funded

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Gill Davies, Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure	
Report Author	Des Waters, Head of Public Realm	
Version	Final	
Dated	13 January 2012	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	No	No
Finance Director	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		13 January 2012

Appendix 1

Devolved Community Council Funded Schemes

Community Council : **Dulwich**

Date: **13 January 2012**

Funding	
Under spend from 2011 -12	£64,257.24
Allocation for this year	£100,000.00
Total available	£164,257.24

Officer Recommendations

Candidate Road	Ward	Identified defects	Suggested treatment	Estimated Cost
Asbourne Grove	East Dulwich	Carriageway : Localised surface degradation and failings of sections of the carriageway between sinusoidal speed humps and around gullies. Signs of local failure at sub-base level.	Carriageway : Plane off and resurface (40mm) sections between humps. (NB: Might be more viable to remove speed humps > resurface > reinstate humps); reinstatement of road marking.	£53,000.00
Chesterfield Grove	East Dulwich	Carriageway : Localised surface degradation and failings of sections of the carriageway between sinusoidal speed humps and around gullies. Signs of local failure at sub-base level.	Carriageway : Plane off and resurface (40mm) sections between humps. (NB: Might be more viable to remove speed humps > resurface > reinstate humps) ; reinstatement of road marking.	£36,300.00
College Rd	College	Carriageway : Localised depressions suggesting sub base / grade failing; repeated patching in various states of degradation; rutting ; longitudinal and transverse cracking	Carriageway : Plane off and resurfacing 40-100mm plus some full depth reconstruction in places ; reinstatement of traffic calming and road marking.	£64,000.00
Seeley Drive	College	Carriageway : Local deformations; potholes; Irregular cracking ;	Carriageway : Plane off and 40mm resurfacing ; reinstatement of 2 speed humps and road marking.	£38,400.00
Colby Rd	College	Carriageway : Localised failings ; kerbstones dislodged near some trees ; severe longitudinal failure. (NB : Access to Colby Rd Nursery needs to be considered) Footway : Uneven northern footway approx 70m long with extensive trenching and patching near intersection with Dulwich Wood Avenue; some cracking due to tree roots	Carriageway : Plane off and resurface (40mm) near intersection with Dulwich Wood Avenue due to low existing kerb upstand ; reinstatement of road marking. Footway : Relay with flexible surfacing and roll over sections near proud tree roots	£27,000.00 £5,000.00
Roseway	Village	Carriageway : Local depressions and failings from degradation ; alligator cracking	Carriageway : Plane off and resurfacing 40mm with some channel reprofiling	£21,000.00

Appendix 2

* The schemes below were proposed as potential locations for consideration from a walkabout on 11 January 2012 between Village ward councillors and council's highways engineers.

Devolved Community Council Funded Schemes

Community Council : Dulwich – Village Ward

Date: 13 January 2012

Candidate Road	Ward	Identified defects	Suggested treatment	Estimated Cost
Townley Road (Outside No.27 - No.47)	Village	Carriageway : Areas have failing trench reinstatements and some surface degradation	Carriageway : Plane off and resurface sections between Property No 27 to 47.	£18,000.00
Townley Road (Outside No.73)	Village	Footway : Uneven footway with extensive trenching and patching; some cracking due to tree roots	Footway : Relay with flexible surfacing and roll over sections near proud tree roots	£3,000.00
Townley Road (Outside No.105 –No 115)	Village	Footway : Uneven footway with extensive trenching and patching; some cracking due to tree roots	Footway : Relay with flexible surfacing and roll over sections near proud tree roots	£22,000.00
Townley Road (Barclays to JW Woodyard Lane)	Village	Footway : Uneven footway with extensive trenching and patching; some cracking due to tree roots	Footway : Relay with flexible surfacing and roll over sections near proud tree roots	£14,000.00
Townley Road (Outside No.188)	Village	Footway : Uneven footway with extensive trenching and patching; some cracking due to tree roots	Footway : Relay with flexible surfacing and roll over sections near proud tree roots	£1,500.00
Turney Road (Outside No.87 – No.89)	Village	Footway : Uneven footway with extensive trenching and patching; some cracking due to tree roots	Footway : Relay with flexible surfacing and roll over sections near proud tree roots	£2,000.00
Turney Road (Outside No.140 – No.142)	Village	Footway : Uneven footway with extensive trenching and patching; some cracking due to tree roots	Footway : Relay with flexible surfacing and roll over sections near proud tree roots	£2,000.00
Turney Road (Outside No.63 – No.65)	Village	Footway : Uneven footway with extensive trenching and patching; some cracking due to tree roots	Footway : Relay with flexible surfacing and roll over sections near proud tree roots	£2,000.00
Croxted Road (Outside No. 224 to Bus Stop)	Village	Footway : Uneven footway with extensive trenching and patching; some cracking due to tree roots	Footway : Relay with flexible surfacing and roll over sections near proud tree roots	£10,000.00
Croxted Road (Outside No. 276 – No. 278)	Village	Footway : Uneven footway with extensive trenching and patching; some cracking due to tree roots	Footway : Relay with flexible surfacing and roll over sections near proud tree roots	£5,000.00

Appendix 3

Devolved Community Council Funded Schemes

Update of Previous Schemes - 2011-12

Location	Description of Project	Ward	Allocation	Total Cost of Works	Balance Remaining	Started	Completed	Comments
Howletts Road	Carriageway Resurfacing	Village	£30,000.00	£5,426.24	£24,573.76	May-11	May-11	Completed - works undertaken under planned maintenance programme
Warmington Road	Carriageway Resurfacing	Village	£30,000.00	£23,649.52	£6,350.48	Sep-11	Sep-11	Completed
Potholes	Carriageway (Potholes)	Village	£3,000.00	£3,000.00	£0.00	various	various	completed
Bowen Drive	Carriageway Resurfacing	College	£45,000.00	£45,000.00	£0.00	Sep-11	Nov-11	completed

Appendix 3

Devolved DCC Funded Schemes - Update on previously funded schemes

Location	Description of Project	Ward	Allocation	Total Cost of Works	Balance Remaining	Started	Completed	Comments
Howletts Road	Carriageway Resurfacing	Village	£30,000.00	£5,426.24	£24,573.76	May-11	May-11	Completed - works undertaken under planned maintenance programme
Warmington Road	Carriageway Resurfacing	Village	£30,000.00	£23,649.52	£6,350.48	Sep-11	Sep-11	Completed
Potholes	Carriageway (Potholes)	Village	£3,000.00	£3,000.00	£0.00	various	various	completed
Bowen Drive	Carriageway Resurfacing	College	£45,000.00	£45,000.00	£0.00	Sep-11	Nov-11	completed

This page is intentionally blank.

**MEMBERS & EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION LIST MUNICIPAL YEAR 2011 – 12
DULWICH COMMUNITY COUNCIL**

NOTE: Original held by Constitutional Team (Community Councils) Beverley Olamijulo
(Tel: 020 7525 7234)

OPEN	COPIES	OPEN	COPIES
To all Members of the Dulwich Community Council:		Trade Unions	
Cllr Lewis Robinson(Chair)	1	UNISON Southwark Branch	1
Cllr Robin Crookshank Hilton (Vice Chair)	1	Roy Fielding, GMB/APEX	1
Cllr James Barber	1	Mike Young TGWU/ACTS	1
Cllr Toby Eckersley	1	Tony O'Brien, UCATT	1
Cllr Helen Hayes	1		
Cllr Rosie Shimell	1		
Cllr Jonathan Mitchell	1	Borough Commander	
Cllr Michael Mithchell	1	Southwark Police Station	
Cllr Andy Simmons	1	323 Borough High Street	
		London SE1 1JL	1
Press:		Total distribution	138
Southwark News	1		
South London Press	1		
Members of Parliament			
Tessa Jowell M.P.	1		
Constitutional Officer	120		
(Community councils)			
2 nd Floor, Hub 4			
Others:			
Shahida Nasim	1		
LBS Audit Manager			
Ground Floor			
Tooley Street			
London SE1P 5LX			