Borough, Bankside and Walworth
Community Council

Wednesday 5 October 2016
7.00 pm
New Covenant Church, 506-510 Old Kent Rd, London SE1 5BA

THEME: Transport: mind the gaps – what is missing?


Membership

Councillor Eleanor Kerslake (Chair)  Councillor Maria Linforth-Hall
Councillor Samantha Jury-Dada (Vice-Chair)  Councillor Rebecca Lury
Councillor Maisie Anderson  Councillor Vijay Luthra
Councillor James Coldwell  Councillor Darren Merrill
Councillor Helen Dennis  Councillor Adele Morris
Councillor Karl Eastham  Councillor David Noakes
Councillor Paul Fleming  Councillor Martin Seaton
Councillor Lorraine Lauder MBE

Members of the committee are summoned to attend this meeting

Eleanor Kelly
Chief Executive
Date: Tuesday 27 September 2016

Order of Business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>PRELIMINARY BUSINESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2. APOLOGIES

1.3. DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS’ INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

Members to declare any interests and dispensations in respect of any item of business to be considered at this meeting.

1.4. ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

The chair to advise whether they have agreed to any item of urgent business being admitted to the agenda.

1.5. MINUTES (Pages 1 - 10)

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 June 2016 to be agreed as a correct record of the meeting, and signed by the chair.

(Feedback about the health workshops by Councillor Maisie Anderson)

2. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ITEMS

2.1. COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Cleaner Greener Safer Fund 2017/18 launch
- Neighbourhoods Fund 2017/18 Launch
- Connect UK – Sally McVicker
- Robert Browning Primary School letter

2.2. SOUTH BANK AND WATERLOO NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (SOWN)

Ben Stephenson, Secretary of SOWN

2.3. PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS (Pages 11 - 13)

Deputation request received from residents and stakeholders in Harper Road.
2.4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (Pages 14 - 16)

This is an opportunity for public questions to be 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.

Responses may be supplied in writing following the meeting.

3. THEME: TRANSPORT 7.40pm

3.1. TRANSPORT: MIND THE GAPS

- Florence Eshalomi, London Assembly Member
- Ian Wingfield, cabinet member for environment and the public realm

3.2. BREAK AND WORKSHOP ABOUT BUS ROUTES

3.3. ELEPHANT AND CASTLE AND GENERAL TFL UPDATES

Steve Kearns and Tom Holmes (TfL)

3.4. CLOSURE OF TOWER BRIDGE

Lauren Barton (TfL), Alex Pocklington (TfL), Grace Manning-Marsh (Temple Group)

4. OFFICIAL COUNCIL BUSINESS 8.30pm

4.1. DEVOLVED HIGHWAYS BUDGET 2014-15 - EAST WALWORTH ALLOCATIONS (Pages 17 - 21)

NOTE: This is an executive function for decision by the community council.

4.2. COMMUNITY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS CAPITAL INVESTMENT FOR 2015-16 AND 2016-17 (Pages 22 - 28)

NOTE: This is an executive function for decision by the community council.
4.3. LOCAL TRAFFIC AND PARKING AMENDMENTS (Pages 29 - 53)

NOTE: This is an executive function for decision by the community council.

4.4. REVIEW OF PARKING CONTROLS IN THE EXISTING C2 PARKING ZONE (Pages 54 - 121)

Councillors to consider the recommendation in the report.

4.5. COMMUNITY COUNCIL QUESTION TO COUNCIL ASSEMBLY

Each community council may submit one question to a council assembly meeting that has previously been considered and noted by the community council.

Any question to be submitted from a community council to council assembly should first be the subject of discussion at a community council meeting. The subject matter and question should be clearly noted in the community council’s minutes and thereafter the agreed question can be referred to the constitutional team.

The community council is invited to consider if it wishes to submit a question to the ordinary meeting of council assembly on 30 November 2016.

Date: Tuesday 27 September 2016
INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

CONTACT: Gerald Gohler, Constitutional Officer Tel: 020 7525 7420 or email: gerald.gohler@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 7420.
Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council

MINUTES of the OPEN section of the Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council held on Wednesday 29 June 2016 at 7.00 pm at Amigo Hall, St George’s Cathedral, Lambeth Road, London SE1 7HY (intersection with St George’s Road)

PRESENT:
Councillor Eleanor Kerslake (Chair)
Councillor Samantha Jury-Dada (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Maisie Anderson
Councillor James Coldwell
Councillor Karl Eastham
Councillor Paul Fleming
Councillor Lorraine Lauder MBE
Councillor Rebecca Lury
Councillor Vijay Luthra
Councillor Darren Merrill
Councillor Adele Morris
Councillor David Noakes
Councillor Martin Seaton

OFFICER SUPPORT:
Laura Hills, Senior Planning Policy Officer
Russell Carter, Consultant in Public Health
Pauline Bonner, Community Council Development Officer
Tim Murtagh, Constitutional Officer

1. PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1.1 INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME
The chair welcomed councillors, members of the public and officers to the meeting.

1.2 APOLOGIES
There were apologies for absence from Councillors Helen Dennis and Maria Linforth-Hall; and for lateness from Councillors Paul Fleming, Lorraine Lauder and Vijay Luthra.
1.3 DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS’ INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

There were none.

1.4 ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

There were no urgent items of business.

1.5 MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 March 2016 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the chair, subject to the following clarification:

Under Item 3.3, Allocation of Neighbourhoods Fund for Cathedrals ward, that the money allocated to the Southwark Neighbourhood Watch Association (Reference: 558392) was for spending in Cathedrals ward.

1.6 LOCAL TRAFFIC AND PARKING AMENDMENTS

Note: This is an executive function.

Councillors considered the information contained in the report. Councillors commented that the report also affected Cathedrals ward, which was not mentioned in the report.

RESOLVED:

1. That the following local traffic and parking amendments be approved for implementation, as detailed in the appendices to the report, subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory consultation and procedures:

   - Rockingham Street – install double yellow lines to prevent inconsiderate parking and maintain traffic flow, install new permit holder bay and extend existing shared use bay.
   - Harper Road – install double yellow lines to prevent inconsiderate parking and maintain traffic flow.
   - Portland Street – remove existing shared use parking bay and install double yellow lines to provide access to the off street yard for large vehicles.
   - Hatfields – extend existing permit holders (C1) parking bay to increase permit parking availability.

2. That the objections received against the following non-strategic traffic management matter be rejected and the traffic order be implemented:

   - Larcom Street – reject objection and instruct officers to convert existing
single yellow line to permit holders (M1) parking bay.

Councillors asked officers to note the comment by the objector about reviewing the disabled parking bays, and that those disabled bays be reviewed.

1.7 WEBBER STREET - INTRODUCTION OF LOADING BAY, PERMIT HOLDER BAYS AND RELOCATION OF SOLO MOTORCYCLE BAY

Note: This is an executive function.

Councillors considered the information contained in the report.

RESOLVED:

That the following non-strategic traffic and parking arrangements, be approved for implementation, as detailed in the appendices to the report, subject to any necessary statutory procedures:

- Valentine Place
  - Provide 12 metre loading bay (where Valentine Row meets Valentine Place)
  - Remove solo motorcycle bay (to be relocated in Webber Street).

- Webber Street
  - Removal of a single yellow line along the frontage of the existing vehicular crossover
  - Removal of four (4) permit holder bays
  - Provide double yellow lines across the new vehicular crossover into the car park
  - Provide new 12 metre loading bay
  - Reprovide solo motorcycle bay (relocated from Valentine Place).

Councillors asked that their concerns over the potential loss of parking bays be noted and that officers update them on this matter along with how the consultation for this item fits in with the forthcoming review of the C2 controlled parking zone.

1.8 NEIGHBOURHOOD FUND ALLOCATIONS

RESOLVED:

That the following amounts of Neighbourhoods Fund be allocated:

**Cathedrals ward**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of group</th>
<th>Name of project / activity</th>
<th>Amount awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peabody Estate</td>
<td>Community engagement programme</td>
<td>£1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mint Street</td>
<td>Summer activities</td>
<td>£4,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.9 FEEDBACK FROM THE CONSULTATION BOOTH AT THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The chair explained that during the last meeting there had been consultations on:

- The future of Walworth Town Hall and library
- East Street Market
- The Walworth Road Post Office.

Feedback on the consultation comments had been circulated on paper to the meeting. Councillor Samantha Jury-Dada summarised the feedback to the meeting. Further updates would be reported back to future community council meetings.

1.10 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING

Laura Hills, Senior Planning Policy Officer, introduced the two applications from the Elephant & Walworth Neighbourhood Forum (EWNF), for the formal designation of the forum itself and the designation of a Walworth neighbourhood area. Laura explained that once formally designated the neighbourhood forum could formulate a neighbourhood plan. That was the first stage in the neighbourhood planning process. A six-week public consultation was taking place. After that consideration would be made of the responses before a decision was made on formal designation.

Jeremy Leach and Fitzroy Ugorji, from the EWNF, gave a presentation which outlined a boundary for the neighbourhood forum area and neighbourhood plan area. The EWNF was a coalition of tenants and residents associations (TRAs), community groups, small businesses and individuals who live and work in the Elephant & Castle and Walworth area. Jeremy and Fitzroy outlined some of the key themes the EWNF had been working on over the last few years.
1. Improving connections  
2. Our heritage  
3. The local economy  
4. Taking care of our green spaces and food growing  
5. Protecting and enhancing community facilities.

In response to questions, Jeremy explained that several local groups and estates had been involved in the process over the last four years. There was support from people and groups from a much wider area to develop neighbourhood plans. However, the advice received, including from the cabinet member for regeneration and new homes, had been that the starting point should be a smaller area. That was why the group was focused initially on a Walworth neighbourhood plan.

Officers explained that at the end of the process there would be a local referendum. In response to a question, on who would be eligible to vote in that referendum, officers said they thought it was everyone in the affected wards, but they would look into that matter further and report back.

2. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ITEMS

2.1 COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS

Link Age Southwark

The chair made an announcement on behalf of Link Age, about their work:

“Link Age Southwark is a charity that offers friendly support to anyone aged 60+ across Southwark with the aim of reducing isolation and loneliness. It makes a positive impact on older people’s quality of life. The charity runs over 20 groups offering activities ranging from singing, bridge and reminiscing to gentle exercise and yoga. Link Age has over 300 wonderful volunteers supporting Southwark’s older people through a weekly visit, helping with driving, escorted shopping, odd jobs and gardening. The charity also offered services to people with mild to moderate dementia. Anyone interested in accessing these services, or becoming a volunteer, should contact: info@linkagesouthwark.org or Tel. 020 8299 2623.”

2.2 PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS

There were none.

2.3 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The following public questions were raised at the meeting:

1. Re: East Street trading and shops encroaching onto the pavement: Why has the council not enforced against this? Traders needing extra space should hire a stall and not take up space on the pavement. The chair and ward councillors responded that they would follow that up with the relevant officers.
2. Re: the Tower Bridge closure planned for the end of 2016: Why was it reported in Southwark News, five months before the Corporation of London gave official notification to the borough of Southwark about the closure? Would officers confirm that the delay of notification was correct and what representations were being made to the Corporation of London about this discourtesy. The discrepancy between public knowledge and official notification required explanation.

The chair said that she would follow up regarding the discrepancy and get a written response for the community council. Councillor Darren Merrill, cabinet member responsible at the time, added that proper notification had not been given until November 2015, although there were rumours prior to that. He explained that he had written to Transport for London (TfL) and the City of London, requesting a delay of works on Tower Bridge Road until after the Tooley Street partial closure, but that had not happened.

3. A member of the EWNF asked for the councillors’ views on the application for designation of the area. The chair responded that she was a member of the neighbourhood forum and was positive and supportive of it and that there were some exciting ideas for the Walworth Road. Several councillors supported the proposals and thanked those involved for their work.

4. A resident asked:
   a) Has the council heard anything yet from the Government about the Housing Bill.
   b) Was there an abstention from Neil Coyle MP, and if so why.
   c) Following the Brexit vote, could housing officers put up notices giving details of who to contact, if anyone was having issues with hate crime or negative comments, following the referendum.

The chair responded that the Housing Bill had gone through. If the resident wanted a response from Neil Coyle MP, he could be contacted directly at neil.coyle.mp@parliament.uk. Re the hate crime question, the chair explained that Councillor Barrie Hargrove was preparing a speech in response to the issue on behalf of the council. Councillor David Noakes added, that a cross party motion would be debated at the next council assembly meeting on 13 July 2016. Several councillors emphasised the need to combat hate crime and to report incidents to the safer neighbourhood teams. Police Inspector Nicholson added, that so far there had not been a rise in hate crime in Southwark but the situation was being monitored across the community networks.

5. A resident expressed concerns about officers recommending disabled parking bays should be removed. Ward councillors responded that they had not seen any proposals about disabled parking bays in Wansey Street and they would follow that up with officers.

The following question was asked later in the meeting:

6. Why does the council expect residents to pay for the green recycle food bags. Previously, they were free. The chair asked for a written response to be provided.
2.4 UPDATE ON LOCAL POLICING

Inspector Martin Nicholson, from the local police team, gave a summary of recent activities.

Local knife crime
There had been a rise in knife crime in recent months. Councillors expressed concerns over the rise and asked for action to be taken in schools to prevent the normalisation of knife crime. Inspector Nicholson explained that two sergeants, from a dedicated schools team, were working daily with schools. Officers had given a lot of crime prevention advice at schools and there had also been visits from Operation Trident officers and a road show in the area.

Stop and search
Inspector Nicholson explained that stop and search was on the rise locally but emphasised that “it wasn’t a fishing expedition” and it was intelligence led. The main target was the search for weapons in the area.

Police levels
Inspector Nicholson said that the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) were re-organising under the new Mayor. Unofficially, it seemed that there would probably be a rise in the number of dedicated ward officers in the area but the number of cluster officers across the three clusters may be reduced.

Policing of community events
Councillors expressed concerns over the policing of large scale community events and enquired how the Police were notified of such events. This followed a recent Burgess Park fair where knife crime occurred. Inspector Nicholson, explained there were various methods of notification. For local community events, a list is usually sent to the senior leadership team who then carry out a risk assessment on whether it needs to be policed. If appropriate, then officers are assigned to attend. If not considered a risk, then details can be passed to the neighbourhood team for their attention. Inspector Nicholson commented that since the Burgess Park event was missed, he now received a comprehensive monthly list of events.

3. THEME - "HEALTH AND FITNESS"

3.1 FREE SWIM AND GYM

Councillor Maisie Anderson, cabinet member for public health, parks and leisure, introduced the item.

Why are we doing this?
- Remove cost as a barrier to physical activity
- Help tackle physical inactivity
- Improve the health of the borough.

What will the scheme achieve?
- Free access for all residents
- Target physical inactivity in the borough
- Free 7 day access for disabled residents
- Extra support with poorer health
- Help to better understand the health of the borough.

Piloting the scheme
- Pilot launched in May 2015
- Open to 18s and under
- Open to over 60s who use the Silver programme for free
- “Exercise on referral” and 7 day a week access to disabled residents at The Castle was introduced in April 2016.

Total registrations during pilot = 11,347; total attendance during pilot = 30,383.

Full Free Swim and Gym
- At all Southwark Council leisure centres
- All day Friday
- Saturday and Sunday 2.00pm until close.
- Disabled residents can access all the centres for free 7 days a week.

What’s next?
Free Swim & Gym for all residents starts at the end of July 2016.

How to register?
- Online at www.everyoneactive.com/southwarkfreeswimandgym/
- Online at Southwark libraries
- Pick up an application form at libraries and leisure centres.

3.2 THEME - FOOD / NUTRITION ITEM

Silverfit - presentation by Eddie Brocklesby

Silverfit uses a sandwich formula for its activities. The general idea was to socialise for around 30 minutes before and after the one hour of activity.

Silver Tuesdays are weekly sessions, not time limited and free. A typical session consisted of:

- Tea and coffee
- Gentle warm up together
- One hour’s activity of choice, outdoor option
  - Walking, Nordic walking
  - Dance, badminton
  - Pilates / yoga/ t’ai chi
  - Walking football, walking basketball
  - Silver cheerleading

Activity benefits hearts, lungs, strength and balance. Benefits of social gatherings include combatting depression, dementia and isolation.

Silver Fit was inspired by London 2012 and has expanded rapidly.
18 venues – 17 activities
- Average weekly attendance - 283
3.3 HEALTH AND FITNESS - WORKSHOPS AND FEEDBACK

Russell Carter, consultant in public health, explained that the rates of obesity among young people in Southwark, were the highest in the country. The new strategy was about taking a life course from maternity services through to old age.

- Family based approach.
- Whole systems approach, working with the clinical commissioning groups and major hospitals in Southwark.
- Prevention and treatment of overweight and obese people.
- Fully evidenced based strategy. Looking at what has worked elsewhere, nationally, internationally and locally.

Actions include:
- UNICEF baby friendly initiative to enable mothers of new born children to feed their babies properly, including the promotion of breastfeeding.
- Free healthy school meals.
- National child measurement programme (weight and measurement) with feedback and options for parents of overweight and obese children.
- Free Swim & Gym.
- Referrals to weight loss groups.
- Specialist services in hospitals including some surgery.

Generally:
- The new Southwark Plan would include restrictions on fast food outlets within 200 metres of secondary schools in the borough.
- Southwark provided safe and attractive parks to encourage physical activity and play.
- Cycle lanes and storage helped to encourage cycling.

The meeting went into workshops for 15 minutes to discuss the issues.

Workshop notes were collected by officers and a brief summary read out by councillors.

4. OTHER OFFICIAL COUNCIL BUSINESS

4.1 COMMUNITY COUNCIL QUESTION TO COUNCIL ASSEMBLY

Members of the community council discussed a possible question to be sent to the meeting of council assembly on 13 July 2016.

RESOLVED:

That the following question be submitted to council assembly as the official
community council question:

“What is the Leader of the Council’s response to concerns following the referendum [on EU membership] about the effects of hate crime on council services.”

The chair asked that written responses to previously submitted community council questions to council assembly, be brought to the next community council meeting and circulated.

Meeting ended at 9.40pm

CHAIR:

DATED:
RECOMMENDATION

1. That the Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council consider a deputation request from residents and other stakeholders in Harper Road.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. The deputation request has been submitted by residents and other stakeholders in Harper Road and refers to traffic issues in Harper Road.

3. The deputation states:

"With the safety, health and well-being of the residents and other stakeholders to the fore, we petition the council to take urgent steps to address the issue of the greatly increased volume, excessive speed, type and size, and associated air-borne pollutions of the traffic using Harper Road as a short cut to and from the A201 New Kent Road avoiding congestion at the Elephant & Castle since the changes to the northern roundabout system commenced.

Following, and in coordination with, any immediate actions deemed possible, we further request a commitment for a study to be urgently undertaken to produce a workable integrated plan for Harper Road and environs in relation to the general increase in traffic heading south from points to the north. This study to be conducted in open consultation with the key stakeholders and to report back in time for funding to be included in 2017-2018 budget."

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. Any relevant resource or community impact issues will be contained in the comments of the strategic director.
KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

7. The deputation shall consist of no more than six persons, including the spokesperson.

8. Only one member of the deputation shall be allowed to address the meeting, her or his speech being limited to five minutes.

9. 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.

10. 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 OFFICERS

Director of Environment

11. Transport for London (TfL) have undertaken detailed traffic surveys whilst the works at Elephant and Castle have been carried out. This data was shared with council officers and Harper Road residents, interested in this matter, on 16 September 2016.

12. The data shows that northbound traffic has changed little since the 2014 baseline survey but that southbound traffic has increased.

13. The next step is for council officers to interrogate the data and then meet with TfL to discuss any measures that may be necessary to minimise the impact of the increase on local residents. Local residents will of course be kept fully engaged throughout the process.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Papers</th>
<th>Held At</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence from representatives of the deputation</td>
<td>160 Tooley Street,</td>
<td>Gerald Gohler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London SE1P 5LX</td>
<td>020 7525 7420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Audit Trail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Officer</th>
<th>Chidi Agada, Principal Constitutional Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report Author</td>
<td>Gerald Gohler, Constitutional Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version</td>
<td>Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dated</td>
<td>23 September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Decision?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Consultation with Other Officers / Directorates / Cabinet Member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer Title</th>
<th>Comments Sought</th>
<th>Comments Included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director of Law and Democracy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Director of Finance and Governance</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Environment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Date final report sent to the Constitutional Team | 23 September 2016 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please could the community council be advised at its meeting on 29 June 2016 of:</td>
<td>During the closure of Tower Bridge, roads in the surrounding area will be busier than usual for all or most of the day. A signed diversion will be in place which will take drivers travelling north over London Bridge and south over Southwark Bridge. During the closure the Congestion Charge will not apply, if you follow the signed diversion. If you deviate from the signed route during charging hours and do not pay the congestion charge, you may incur a penalty. For the latest updates on how London’s roads are operating, check before you travel at: tfl.gov.uk/trafficnews and follow @TfLTrafficNews on Twitter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the implications for traffic flows in the north of the Borough of the proposed total closure Tower Bridge for three months from 1 October 2016;</td>
<td>Buses: The 42, 78 and RV1 use Tower Bridge as part of their route, the 78 and RV1 will be on diversion, the 42 will be curtailed. Allow more time for your journey and plan ahead. Visit tfl.gov.uk/bus/status and follow @TfLBusAlerts on Twitter for the latest bus updates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the steps taken by Southwark council members and officers in this matter since the closure was first mooted around a year ago, and further steps now proposed to be taken;</td>
<td>Pedestrians: A pedestrian closure will be required for three weekends during the works. Dates for these closures are currently being confirmed. Pedestrians will be able to cross the bridge as normal at all other times. Travel advice for all road users and customers is available at: tfl.gov.uk/tower-bridge-closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whether a &quot;night-time only&quot; closure was considered, and, if so, why was it dropped;</td>
<td>The council was officially made aware of the Corporation of London’s wish to carry out maintenance works to Tower Bridge in November 2015. No formal engagement with Southwark Council had been received until then, when we received an email from the project manager. Due to the late notification, the council has made an official objection to both TfL and the City of London Corporation. The objection was overruled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whether, with regard to bridges under the control of the City of London and/or its appendages, Southwark council has any view as to the balance of powers between the City and the relevant riverine Borough(s).</td>
<td>Due to the nature of the works, once the operation starts it will be impossible to open the road to traffic. One of the repairs requires the rams that operate the bridge to be disconnected, which means the bridge will be in the open position. Other works include resurfacing the bridge. This also requires a full closure. The council are satisfied that the City of London Corporation are responsible for major maintenance works to Tower Bridge. The bridge is owned, funded and managed from private funds by the historic Bridge House Estates (whom the City of London Corporation are the Trustee of). The road that crosses the bridge is the A100 which is a TfL red route road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Bridge closure planned for the end of 2016</td>
<td>This project has been jointly funded by The Corporation for the City of London, Transport for London and English Heritage. It is unclear how or who released the information to the public as so many individuals within these organisation have been involved in planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why was it reported in Southwark News, five months before the Corporation of London gave official notification to the borough of Southwark about the closure? Would officers confirm that the delay of notification was correct and what representations were being made to the Corporation of London about this discourtesy. The discrepancy between public knowledge and official notification required explanation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Street trading and shops encroaching onto the pavement</td>
<td>Unfortunately the council cannot offer any fruit or vegetable pitches on the market, as officers have now placed an embargo due to fact there are enough. Officers are looking at having a varied offer of commodities on the market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why has the council not enforced against this? Traders needing extra space should hire a stall and not take up space on the pavement. The chair and ward councillors responded that they would follow that up with the relevant officers.</td>
<td>Officers are in the process of reviewing all shop fronts on East Street, in order for them to complement the area and not encroach on public safety. The traders in the shops are not allowed to make sales on the street and there has been recent and on-going enforcement against this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop fronts have been licensed on East Street, however due to conditions of licenses not being adhered to officers are formulating a new and more robust approach, so the council can create a safe and thriving space. This is expected to be implemented in the next few months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Why does the council expect residents to pay for the green recycle food bags. Previously they were free.”</td>
<td>Compostable bags for food waste caddies were provided free of charge to residents until 31 March 2015. The withdrawal of free compostable food waste bag provision was one of a range of measures taken by the council to ensure that funding for the services that matter the most to residents would continue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no absolute requirement to use compostable bags to line food waste caddies. A sheet of newspaper can be used to line caddies. The use of plastic sacks is not acceptable and this would contaminate the loads collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compostable food waste bags are available through local retail outlets and on-line suppliers. More information about the food waste service is available on the council website at:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/530/food_and_garden_waste">http://www.southwark.gov.uk/info/530/food_and_garden_waste</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is the lighting in the open stairwell at 18 Comus Places, Flats 1-4, SE17 1TQ on all the time? The stairwell is fitted with heat and motion detectors, so the lighting should only come on during the presence of movement.</td>
<td>18 Comus Place is managed by L&amp;Q Housing Association. The question is therefore not within the remit of the council. Officers have forwarded this question to the local L&amp;Q housing for a response, but have not received one. L&amp;Q did not want to give council officers the direct contact details of the officer responsible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION

1. To agree the funding of the schemes proposed by ward members for the Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council and set out in Appendix 1; or to agree alternative schemes subject to officer investigation and feasibility.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. The declining quality of public highway combined with extreme weather events has led to further deterioration in recent years – 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 council’s reactive maintenance programme.

3. The council’s non-principal road investment programme prioritises works on non-principal roads on a borough-wide basis and this investment forms the largest part of the annual investment programme.

4. Since 2011-12, each community council has received devolved funding to implement local priorities that would not be a corporate priority for funding.

5. The financial provision for each community council is pro-rata by ward, as published in highways capital investment programme 2014-15 dated 12 December 2013 and also found at: [http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/documents/s43081/Report.pdf#search=%22highways%20capital%20investment%20programme%202014%22](http://moderngov.southwark.gov.uk/documents/s43081/Report.pdf#search=%22highways%20capital%20investment%20programme%202014%22)

6. Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council was allocated £190,475 in 2014-15 to be used for its highways surface improvements (carriageway or footway) of its choice. These can be spent on any non-principal road in the area. This report contains unanimously agreed proposal for Morecambe Street from East Walworth ward members. Proposal from East Walworth ward members need to be agreed in forthcoming Borough, Bankside & Walworth Community Council meeting.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

7. Following last Borough, Bankside & Walworth Community Council meeting, officers wrote to Newington and East Walworth members seeking their proposals. East Walworth Ward propose to allocate their funding to Morecambe Street which is
incorporated in Appendix 1. This need to be agreed in forthcoming Borough, Bankside & Walworth meeting. Any funds remaining unallocated after this meeting will be carried over into the 15-16 programme for allocation at a future meeting.

8. The overall remaining 14-15 budget available to the Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council is £120,780. Bowling Green Place was approved on 21 November 2015 is also highlighted in Appendix 1. Any funds remaining unallocated after this meeting will be carried over into the 15-16 programme for allocation at a future meeting.

9. The commencement and completion of the schemes within the current financial year will depend upon the decision by the community council, subject to any adverse weather conditions later in the winter months.

Community council selections

10. 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. In addition to the resurfacing selections provided it, the money (or part thereof) could be spent on minor patching and pothole repairs should a community council wish to do so.

Delivery

11. Once the community council has made its selections by the method of its choice they will be designed and delivered as soon as possible. Any under spends or projected overspends will be reported back to community council for resolution or reallocation.

Community impact statement

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

Financial implications

13. The overall programme for the works covered in this report are based on initial estimates and may fluctuate due to varying circumstances such as sub strata conditions or other adjacent works which may require the work items and estimates to be adjusted.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS
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</tr>
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<td>Highways Capital</td>
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<td>PO Box 64529</td>
<td>or Matthew Hill 020 7525 3541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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**APPENDIX 1**

**Devolved Community Council Funded Schemes – Ward members proposals for 2014-15**

**Community Council : Borough, Bankside and Walworth Cc**

**Date:** 11 May 2016

**Funding**

- Under spend from previous years: £38,952
- Allocation for FY 2014-15: £190,475
- Implementation Fees: £13,333
- Approved Schemes total till date: £95,314
- Total available for 2014-15: £120,780

**Ward Member’s Proposals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Road</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Carriageway/Footway</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Street</td>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>£37,986</td>
<td>Approved on 16 September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colnbrook Street</td>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>£38,976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green Place</td>
<td>Chaucer</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>£30,891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green Place</td>
<td>Chaucer</td>
<td>Footway</td>
<td>£29,452</td>
<td>Approved on 21 November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Street</td>
<td>Chaucer</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>£36,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Street</td>
<td>Chaucer</td>
<td>Footway</td>
<td>£51,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow Row</td>
<td>Chaucer</td>
<td>Footway</td>
<td>£25,720</td>
<td>Localised Refurbishment East Side only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham Street</td>
<td>Chaucer</td>
<td>Footway</td>
<td>£21,572</td>
<td>Localised Refurbishment work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ruskin Street</td>
<td>Newington</td>
<td>Footway</td>
<td>£27,876</td>
<td>Approved on 16 September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faunce Street</td>
<td>Newington</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>£29,753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Street</td>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>£29,847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Street</td>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>Footway</td>
<td>£83,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Suffolk Street</td>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>Footway</td>
<td>£18,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidge Street</td>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>£23,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholson Street</td>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>Footway</td>
<td>£31,478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrell Street</td>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>£27,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrell Street</td>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>Footway</td>
<td>£26,585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta/Ambergate Street</td>
<td>Newington</td>
<td>Footway</td>
<td>£15,342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morecambe Street</td>
<td>East Walworth</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>£41,278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morecambe Street</td>
<td>East Walworth</td>
<td>Footway</td>
<td>£31,258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Total**  £659,254

Note: to date, no feasible proposals have been put forward for Faraday wards
### APPENDIX 2

Extract (Appendix 4 of the highways capital investment programme for 2014-15 – community council investment allocations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Council</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Allocation (£)</th>
<th>Total (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bermondsey and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Grange</td>
<td>38,095</td>
<td>209,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livesey (part)</td>
<td>19,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rotherhithe</td>
<td>38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Bermondsey</td>
<td>38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surrey Docks</td>
<td>38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough, Bankside and Walworth</td>
<td>Cathedrals</td>
<td>38,095</td>
<td>190,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaucer</td>
<td>38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Walworth</td>
<td>38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faraday</td>
<td>38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newington</td>
<td>38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Brunswick Park</td>
<td>38,095</td>
<td>114,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camberwell Green</td>
<td>38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Camberwell</td>
<td>38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>38,095</td>
<td>114,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Dulwich</td>
<td>38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham and Nunhead</td>
<td>Livesey (part)</td>
<td>19,050</td>
<td>171,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nunhead</td>
<td>38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peckham</td>
<td>38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peckham Rye</td>
<td>38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Lane</td>
<td>38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Item No.**
4.2

**Classification:**
Open

**Date:**
5 October 2016

**Meeting Name:**
Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council

**Report title:**
Community Council Highways Capital Investment for 2015-16 and 2016-17

**Ward(s) or groups affected**
All in the community council area

**From:**
Head of Highways

**RECOMMENDATION**

1. To agree the funding of schemes proposed by ward members for Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council as set out in Appendix 1; or to agree alternative schemes subject to officer investigation and feasibility.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

2. The declining quality of public highway combined with extreme weather events has led to further deterioration in recent years – 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 council’s reactive maintenance programme.

3. The council’s non-principal road investment programme prioritises works on non-principal roads on a borough-wide basis and this investment forms the largest part of the annual investment programme.

4. Since 2011-12, each community council has received devolved funding to implement local priorities that would not be a corporate priority for funding.

5. The financial provision for each community council is pro-rata by ward, as published in Highways Capital Investment Programme 2014-15 dated 12 December 2013 and can also be found at:

6. Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council have been allocated £380,950 for highway improvement works (carriageway and footways) of its choice. This is a combined allocation for financial years 2015-16 and 2016-17 and it can be spent on any non-principal road in the area. This is in addition to £21,270 of underspend from previous years giving a total available of £402,220. It is hoped that enough works will be proposed and implemented to fully spend the allocation to bring yearly allocations and works up-to-date.

7. This report contains proposals from all five wards (Cathedrals, Chaucer, East Walworth, Faraday, & Newington), which are yet to be approved at the forthcoming Borough, Bankside and Walworth meeting.
KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

8. Following the last Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council meeting, officers wrote to all wards to request for outstanding and additional proposals. Refer to Appendix 1 for a summary of the proposals received so far for each ward. These and any other proposal needs to be approved at the forthcoming Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council meeting to allow works to start.

9. The overall remaining budget available to Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council including underspend from 2014-15 is £402,220, assuming that the Community Council supports all the proposals put forward so far as detailed in Appendix 1. Funds remaining unallocated after this meeting will be allocated to further proposals from ward members and agreed at a future meeting or carried over into the 2017-18 programme for allocation.

10. The commencement and completion of the schemes within the current financial year will depend upon the decision by the community council, subject to any adverse weather conditions later in the winter months.

Community council selections

11. 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. In addition to the resurfacing selections provided it, the money (or part thereof) could be spent on minor patching and pothole repairs should a community council wish to do so.

Delivery

12. Once the community council has made its selections by the method of its choice they will be designed and delivered as soon as possible in 2016-17. Any under spends or projected overspends will be reported back to community council for resolution or reallocation.

Community impact statement

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

Financial implications

14. The overall programme for the works covered in this report are based on initial estimates and may fluctuate due to varying circumstances such as sub strata conditions or other adjacent works which may require the work items and estimates to be adjusted.
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### Devolved Community Council Funded Schemes
#### Ward members proposals for 2015-16

**Community Council**: Borough, Bankside and Walworth Cc  
**Date**: 20 September 2016

#### Funding
- Under spend from previous year: £21,270
- Allocation for FY 2015-16 & 2016-17: £380,950
- Implementation Fees (10%): -£38,095
- Proposed Schemes total till date: -£365,946

**Projected Overspend Total**: -£1,371

#### Ward Member’s Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Road</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Carriageway/Footway</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cole Street</td>
<td>Chaucer</td>
<td>Footway</td>
<td>£22,870</td>
<td>Yet to be approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter Street</td>
<td>Chaucer</td>
<td>Footway</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
<td>Yet to be approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool Grove</td>
<td>Faraday</td>
<td>Footway</td>
<td>£61,054</td>
<td>Yet to be approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwood Street</td>
<td>Faraday</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>£7,483</td>
<td>Yet to be approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walworth Place</td>
<td>Faraday</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>£17,235</td>
<td>Yet to be approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawes Street</td>
<td>Faraday</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td></td>
<td>Part of NPR Programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodson Street</td>
<td>Cathedrals</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>£23,850</td>
<td>Yet to be approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodson Street</td>
<td>Cathedrals</td>
<td>Footway</td>
<td>£19,850</td>
<td>Yet to be approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrell Street</td>
<td>Cathedrals</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>£24,862</td>
<td>Yet to be approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Street</td>
<td>Cathedrals</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>£46,842</td>
<td>Yet to be approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidge Street</td>
<td>Cathedrals</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>£17,500</td>
<td>Yet to be approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholson Street</td>
<td>Cathedrals</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>£18,870</td>
<td>Yet to be approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Road</td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>Carriageway/Footway</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson Street</td>
<td>Cathedrals</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>£18,785</td>
<td><em>Development Work</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disney Place</td>
<td>Cathedrals</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>£28,900</td>
<td><em>On-going Development work</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepper Street</td>
<td>Cathedrals</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>£18,785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsted Street</td>
<td>Cathedrals</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>£28,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooks Road</td>
<td>Newington</td>
<td>Footway</td>
<td>£27,845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooks Road</td>
<td>Newington</td>
<td>Carriageway</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Total</td>
<td>£365,946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 2

Extract (Appendix 4 of the Highways Capital Investment Programme – Yearly Community Council Investment Allocations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Council</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bermondsey and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Grange</td>
<td>£38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livesey (part)</td>
<td>£19,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>£38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rotherhithe</td>
<td>£38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Bermondsey</td>
<td>£38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surrey Docks</td>
<td>£38,095</td>
<td>£209,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough, Bankside and</td>
<td>Cathedrals</td>
<td>£38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walworth</td>
<td>Chaucer</td>
<td>£38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Walworth</td>
<td>£38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faraday</td>
<td>£38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newington</td>
<td>£38,095</td>
<td>£190,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Brunswick Park</td>
<td>£38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camberwell Green</td>
<td>£38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Camberwell</td>
<td>£38,095</td>
<td>£114,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>£38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Dulwich</td>
<td>£38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>£38,095</td>
<td>£114,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham and</td>
<td>Livesey (part)</td>
<td>£19,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nunhead</td>
<td>£38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peckham</td>
<td>£38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peckham Rye</td>
<td>£38,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Lane</td>
<td>£38,095</td>
<td>£171,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£800,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2015-16 & 2016-17 Combined Community Council Investment Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Council</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bermondsey and Rotherhithe</td>
<td>Grange</td>
<td>£76,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Livesey (part)</td>
<td>£38,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>£76,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rotherhithe</td>
<td>£76,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Bermondsey</td>
<td>£76,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surrey Docks</td>
<td>£76,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£419,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough, Bankside and Walworth</td>
<td>Cathedrals</td>
<td>£76,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaucer</td>
<td>£76,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Walworth</td>
<td>£76,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faraday</td>
<td>£76,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newington</td>
<td>£76,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£380,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>Brunswick Park</td>
<td>£76,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camberwell Green</td>
<td>£76,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Camberwell</td>
<td>£76,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£228,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulwich</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>£76,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Dulwich</td>
<td>£76,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>£76,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£228,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham and</td>
<td>Livesey (part)</td>
<td>£38,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nunhead</td>
<td>£76,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peckham</td>
<td>£76,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peckham Rye</td>
<td>£76,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Lane</td>
<td>£76,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£342,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£1,600,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that the following local traffic and parking amendments, detailed in the appendices to this report, are approved for implementation subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory consultation and procedures:

1.1 Harper Road – to install new double yellow lines and shared (permit and pay by phone) parking bay outside Ellington House to include newly adopted highway in Newington (D) controlled parking zone.

1.2 Rodney Road – to reduce existing Permit Holders (M1) parking bay to increase the length of existing bus stop to provide better access for London Buses.

1.3 Walworth Road junction with Heygate Street – installation of yellow box junction

2. It is recommended that the objections received against a non-strategic traffic management order are considered and determined as follows.

2.1 Rockingham Street – reject objection and proceed to install double yellow lines to prevent inconsiderate parking and maintain traffic flow and install a new permit holder bay and extend the existing shared use bay.

2.2 Harper Road - reject objections and proceed to install double yellow lines to prevent inconsiderate parking and maintain traffic flow.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

3. Paragraph 20 of Part 3H of the Southwark Constitution sets out that the community council will take decisions on the following local non-strategic matters:

- the introduction of single traffic signs
- the introduction of short lengths of waiting and loading restrictions
- the introduction of road markings
- the setting of consultation boundaries for consultation on traffic schemes
- the introduction of destination disabled parking bays
- statutory objections to origin disabled parking bays
- determination of objections to traffic management orders that do not relate to strategic or borough-wide issues

4. This report gives recommendations for local traffic and parking amendments,
involving traffic signs, waiting restrictions and road markings.

5. The origins and reasons for the recommendations are discussed within the key issues section of this report.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

6. A local parking or traffic amendment (LPA) is a small project to change an existing parking restriction or to introduce a new one or other non-strategic traffic changes.

7. These tend to be carried out in locations where we have had a request to look at dangerous or obstructive parking and where small lengths of restrictions could provide a solution.

8. Local parking amendments are batched together and carried through a quarterly programme. During the second quarter of 2016/17, the council is proposing two LPAs as summarised in figure 1. The council is also proposing one junction improvement also in figure 1.

9. The rationale for each proposal is discussed in the associated appendix. A detailed design of the proposal is included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Appendix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harper Road</td>
<td>to install new double yellow lines and shared (permit and pay by phone) parking bay outside Ellington House to include newly adopted highway in Newington (D) controlled parking zone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Road</td>
<td>to reduce existing Permit Holders (M1) parking bay to increase the length of existing bus stop to provide better access for London Buses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walworth Road junction with Heygate Street</td>
<td>to install yellow box junction marking to assist bus and cycle movements</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1

10. Statutory consultation has recently been carried out on two items approved by the community council on 29 June 2016. During the statutory consultation, objections to the proposals were received.

11. The detail of the objections is summarised in figure 2. The associated appendix contains detail on the objections and a detailed design of the proposal.
Policy implications

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

- Policy 1.1 – pursue overall traffic reduction
- Policy 4.2 – create places that people can enjoy
- Policy 8.1 – seek to reduce overall levels of private motor vehicle traffic on our streets.

Community impact statement

13. The policies within the transport plan are upheld within this report have been subject to an equality impact assessment.

14. The recommendations are area based and therefore will have greatest affect upon those people living working or traveling in the vicinity of the areas where the proposals are made.

15. The introduction of yellow lines at junctions gives benefit to all road users through the improvement of inter-visibility and therefore road safety.

16. There is a risk that new restrictions may cause parking to be displaced and, indirectly, have an adverse impact upon road users and neighbouring properties at that location. However this cannot be entirely preempted until the recommendation have been implemented and observed.

17. With the exception of those benefits and risks identified above, the recommendations are not considered to have a disproportionate effect on any other community or group.

18. The recommendations support the council’s equalities and human rights policies and promote social inclusion by:

- Providing improved access for key services such as emergency and refuse vehicles.
- Improving road safety, in particular for vulnerable road users, on the public highway.

Resource implications

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

**Legal implications**

20. Traffic management orders would be made under powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984.

21. Should the recommendations be approved the council will give notice of its intention to make a traffic order in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

22. These regulations also require the council to consider any representations received as a result of publishing the draft order for a period of 21 days following publication of the draft order.

23. Should any objections be received they must be properly considered in light of administrative law principles, human rights law and relevant statutory powers.

24. By virtue of section 122, the council must exercise its powers under the RTRA 1984 so as to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic including pedestrians, and provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway.

25. These powers must be exercised so far as practicable having regard to the following matters

   a) The desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises
   b) The effect on the amenities of any locality affected including the regulation and restriction of heavy commercial traffic so as to preserve or improve amenity
   c) The national air quality strategy
   d) Facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and securing the safety and convenience of their passengers
   e) Any other matters appearing to the council to be relevant.

**Consultation**

26. For the recommendations in paragraph 1, the implementation of changes to parking requires the making of a traffic order. The procedures for making a traffic order are defined by national Regulations which include statutory consultation and the consideration of any arising objections.

27. Should the recommendations be approved the council must follow the procedures contained with Part II and III of the regulation which are supplemented by the council's own processes. This process is summarised as:

   a) publication of a proposal notice in a local newspaper (Southwark News)
   b) publication of a proposal notice in the London Gazette
   c) display of notices in roads affected by the orders
   d) consultation with statutory authorities
   e) making available for public inspection any associated documents (eg. plans, draft orders, statement of reasons) via the council's website or by

---

2 [http://www.southwark.gov.uk/trafficorders](http://www.southwark.gov.uk/trafficorders)
appointment at 160 Tooley Street, SE1
f) a 21 day consultation period during which time any person may comment upon or object to the proposed order

28. Following publication of the proposal notice, any person wanting to object must make their objection in writing, state the grounds on which it is made and send to the address specified on the notice.

29. Should an objection be made that officers are unable to resolve so that it is withdrawn, it will be reported to the community council for determination. The community council will then consider whether to modify the proposal, accede to or reject the objection. The council will subsequently notify all objectors of the final decision.

Programme Timeline

30. If these items are approved by the community council they will be progressed in line with the below, approximate timeline:

- Traffic orders (statutory consultation) – October to November 2016
- Implementation – December 2016/January 2017
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APPENDICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 1</td>
<td>Harper Road – install double yellow lines and shared use parking bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 2</td>
<td>Rodney Road – extend existing bus stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 3</td>
<td>Rockingham Street – objection determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 4</td>
<td>Harper Road – objection determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 5</td>
<td>Walworth Road – install yellow box junction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Local parking amendment

A local parking amendment (LPA) is a small project to change an existing parking restriction or to introduce a new one. These tend to be carried out in locations where we have had a request to look at dangerous or obstructive parking and where small lengths of restrictions could provide a solution.

Request

For Southwark’s Highways department to adopt the road and extend the current CPZ onto the road due to the following:

Concerns over uncontrolled parking in this location have been raised by traders on Harper Road for some time. This has resulted in tensions running so high that at least one serious altercation has taken place so far this year.

Southwark Council’s Planning Projects team have £100,000 to spend on improving the local retail environment and have consulted local stakeholders including traders, residents and councillors. This funding can be spent on improving the public realm surrounding shopping parades as well as improving shop frontages and other associated external works. Through this consultation, traders identified the need to resolve issues regarding on-going parking problems as a priority. Traders initially requested that the parking subject to controlled parking with one hour free parking bays to allow short stays and a regular turnover to allows for deliveries and customer parking. Officers explained the difficulty of enforcing one hour parking bays it is understood that this would not resolve the current issues effectively.

Southwark Council’s Housing department currently own the road in question hence the land requires adoption by Southwark Council’s Highways Department in order to be able to implement the CPZ.

The most appropriate approach to alleviate these issues is for Highways to adopt the road and to extend the current CPZ into this road. Stakeholders have been advised of this and have been given an opportunity to respond. No objections to this approach have been raised within time period given hence it has been concluded that the general consensus has been reached to adopt the road and extend the CPZ.

Location

The public highway in Harper Road falls within the Newington (D) CPZ. The zone has been in operation since the 70s and covers a large area bordering Long Lane, Tower Bridge Road, New Kent Road and Newington Causeway.

All parking restrictions on the public highway, within the zone operate Monday to Friday, 8.30am to 6.30pm. (i.e. either a parking permit is required, or use of pay and display during the operational times).

The on-street parking is largely prioritised for zone (D) permit holders. There are sections on single yellow lines in the street, whilst these are controlled and enforced during the CPZ times, outside the day/hours, the restriction does not apply and any motorist is entitled to park on the yellow line.
Harper Road is located in the north of the borough close to Elephant and Castle. Whilst the street is largely residential, it is noted that there are many commercial properties, such as shops and restaurants within short walking distance. This makes the street an attractive parking location for non-residents.

### Investigation and conclusions

The road in front of the Harper Road shopping parade is currently owned by Housing. In order the implement a Controlled Parking Zone on this stretch the road would need to be adopted.

Preliminary discussions have taken place with the responsible officers in Housing and Public Realm and an in principle agreement to adopt the road has been reached subject to the agreement of local stakeholders hence the road adoption is being presented to the Community Council meeting for agreement.

At present a motorist can leave their vehicle parked, for days, weeks or months, creating very little turnover in parking for the traders. This section of Harper Road is heavily parked as it is “soaking up” the pressure (i.e. motorists are avoiding having to pay to park in the nearby CPZ bays as they know they can park outside this parade for free).

There is currently totally free, unrestricted and unenforceable parking outside the parade of shops on Harper Road which has resulted in tensions and altercations hence this situation needs to be resolved as soon as possible.

Throughout the borough the majority of shared use bays have a 4 hour maximum stay period. This is deemed a sensible time period. 1 hour is considered as too short, i.e. there could be someone visiting the hairdressers or a restaurant and need longer than 1 hour. Also the 1 hour maximum stay period is difficult to enforce, as it involves the parking attendant regularly visiting the location to monitor and record the parking activity.

An echelon parking configuration was considered, however the minimum standards for safe echelon parking cannot be met without reconfiguring the road layout and moving the Santander bike hub which would result in spending all and possibly exceeding the £100,000 budget. For this reason parallel parking is being recommended.

### Recommendation

Based on our investigation and conclusions, the Council is recommending that the road in front of the parade of shops on Harper Road is adopted and that the existing CPZ is extended to this road.

A detailed design drawing of the proposal is provided within this document.

### Next steps

Should the community council approve this local parking amendment, it is expected that statutory consultation will commence in November.

Following the statutory consultation period, the council will make arrangements to install the restrictions (road marking and signage at the location).

Should objections be received during the statutory consultation period, these will be presented at the next community council meeting for determination.
## Local parking amendment

A local parking amendment (LPA) is a small project to change an existing parking restriction or to introduce a new one. These tend to be carried out in locations where we have had a request to look at dangerous or obstructive parking and where small lengths of restrictions could provide a solution.

### Request

As part of their Road Modernisation Programme, Transport for London (TfL) has identified several locations where improvements to the highway would reduce bus journey times.

TfL have requested that a bay in the M1 CPZ is shortened to assist buses in exiting the stop.

### Location

The proposed measure is at bus stop ‘RU’ on Rodney Road, approximately 50m west of Wadding Street.

### Investigation and conclusions

TfL have reported that their data shows that the 136 bus route is experiencing delays in the northbound direction due to the bus stop’s proximity to parked vehicles.

The bays would be replaced by a lengthened bus cage to assist buses exiting the stop. An additional benefit of this intervention would be to reduce the likelihood of a bus entering the opposing traffic lane.

### Recommendation

Officers recommend that the Community Council approves the implementation of the proposals as shown in the attached drawing.

### Next steps

Should the community council approve this local parking amendment, it is expected that statutory consultation will commence in October 2016.

Following the statutory consultation period, the council will make arrangements to implement on site.

Should objections be received during the statutory consultation period, these will be presented at the next community council meeting for determination.

### Local parking amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Location overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15202-136.6</td>
<td>Rodney Road near Wadding Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Location overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reduce the length of the existing parking bays by 9.0m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community council meeting</th>
<th>Location overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borough, Bankside and Walworth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community council date</th>
<th>Location overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 October 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward(s) affected</th>
<th>Location overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Walworth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed reduction in length of parking bay to allow extension of bus cage.
### Local parking amendment

**Determination of statutory objection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>15/16_Q1_001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Rockingham Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>To Install double yellow lines adjacent to junctions with Bath Terrace, Tiverton Street and off street parking areas to improve traffic flow and access at any time. To install new permit holder bay and extend existing shared use bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community council meeting</td>
<td>Borough, Bankside and Walworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community council date</td>
<td>5 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward(s) affected</td>
<td>Chaucer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background

At the community council meeting held on 29 June 2016, Members approved his proposal subject to the outcome of statutory consultation.

The proposal originates from a request from a resident of the Rockingham Tenants and Resident Association raising concerns about obstructive and dangerous parking on Rockingham Street. The parking design team has been informed that a meeting has taken place with the residents association along with parking operations and police & community safety. Residents have raised concerns that parking is becoming an urgent safety issue with motorists parking dangerously and inconsiderately in Rockingham Street blocking vehicular access.

Statutory consultation was carried out between 18 August 2016 and 08 September 2016. During this period, the council received two objections.

Paragraph 16 of Part 3H of the Southwark Constitution sets out that the community council will take decisions on the following local non-strategic matters:

- determination of objections to traffic management orders that do not relate to strategic or borough-wide issues

### Summary of objection(s)

The objection received is attached to this report and can be summarised as:

- The proposal will potentially result in an increase of vehicle speeds with the existing 20mph speed limit being ignored
- Increase of traffic from Elephant and Castle
- Lack of out of hours parking

Officers wrote to the objectors acknowledging receipt of their representation. They were also advised that their objection would be sent to the Borough, Bankside and Walworth community council for determination.

### Recommendation and next steps

It is recommended that the objection made against the proposal to Install double yellow lines adjacent to junctions with Bath Terrace, Tiverton Street and off street parking areas to improve traffic flow and access at any time. To install new permit holder bay and extend existing shared use bay be considered and rejected.
The highway width in Rockingham Street varies between 7.7 metres and 4.2 metres and there are certain sections in the road where double yellow lines are required to improve safety for all road users.

It was noted during the visit that there is scope to increase permit parking and to provide additional resident parking spaces.

**Further rationale for double yellow lines**

- Ensuring adequate visibility between road users is important for safety. Visibility should generally be sufficient to allow road users to see potential conflicts or dangers in the advance of the distance in which they will be able to brake and come to a stop.

- Vehicles that are parked at a junction have the effect of substantially reducing visibility between road users and reducing stopping sight distances (SSD). This is the viewable distance required for a diver to see so that they can make a complete stop before colliding with something in the street, e.g. pedestrian, cyclist or a stopped vehicle.

- It is noted that almost two thirds of cyclist killed or seriously injured in 2013 were involved in collisions at, or near, a road junction, with "T" junctions being the most commonly involved.

- Children and those in wheelchairs (whose eyelevel is below the height of a parked car) are disproportionately affected by vehicles parked too close to a junction. The Guide Dogs for the Blind Association (Guide Dogs) strongly recommend that yellow lines are implemented at junctions as these are potentially more dangerous.

- The Highway Code makes it clear that motorists must not park within 10 metres of a junction, unless in a designated parking bay. However the council has no power to enforce this without the introduction of a traffic order and subsequent implementation of waiting restrictions (yellow lines).

- The proposal to install yellow lines at this junction is in accordance with the council’s adopted Southwark Streetscape Design Manual (SSDM) design standard on Highway Visibility (DS114 – Highway Visibility)

---

**Objection 1**

Dear Sirs,

With respect to the proposed changes to the parking restrictions as referenced above, I wish to raise some objections and comments in relation to the orders covering Harper Road, Bath Terrace, Rockingham Street and Tiverton Street.

At the present time the key stakeholders, (residents and users of the area contained within a boundary demarcated by a part of Borough High Street, Newington Causeway, New Kent Road, and Gt Dover Street), are blighted by a significant increase in the volumes of traffic of all types and sizes wriggling its way southward and doing so to avoid the perceived congestion at the re-modelled Elephant & Castle circulatory system. This is mainly along Harper Road, but includes feeder roads both into and out of it leading to the New Kent Road, (so, Tiverton Street, Bath Terrace, Meadow Row, Rockingham Street, etc.).

This blight results in increased safety issues both from a health and risk to life and limb basis due to the uncontrolled excessive speed of much of this traffic, and continues virtually on a 24/7 time-frame.
Whilst I believe that there could easily be some better re-organisation of the existing line marking on Harper Road, (for example, why is there but a single line from County Street to the junction with New Kent Road, when in the other direction back to the Globe Academy, there is a double yellow line), the permitting of parking out of general daytime and peak hours provides some limited control over the speed of part of the traffic. Personally, I believe that an expansion of the number of parking bays would be of benefit.

The problem quoted in terms of Harper Road, is not the fact that parking is permitted outside of the CPZ hours, but rather the increased volume, type and speed of the traffic now using Harper Road; the speed limit of 20 mph and the assertion of the Council that from March 2016 that it would take action on all Borough roads that failed to illustrate a serious reduction in general traffic speed to below 24 mph are totally ignored, by both users and the Council, the latter who leave themselves open to judicial review for failing to act on their stated management plans and the waste of tax-payers money involved.

Yours faithfully,

Objection

In February I raised this issue with you on the understanding that you would endeavor to resolve the issue in a way that would benefit residents. You and your colleagues support for residents has been at best lukewarm given the

1) Lack of real resolution to traffic incidence on Harper Road

2) Lack of meaningful consultation

at worst irresponsible given the solutions

1) Double yellow lines

2) More Traffic through Harper Road

You as our representative should be able to effectively represent us and that would mean protecting what we have or enhancing what we have as a community. I do not expect council workers to represent me or understand my requirements but I do expect elected councilors to represent the community that voted for them rather than follow policies that are going to blight the lives of residents based on ideology.

The policies I mention above would include

a) Allowing TfL to blight the lives of local Residents by rerouting traffic away from Elephant castle "roundabout" experiment

b) Engaging in a life-threatening ideology about no parking in new builds when we need car parking spaces (Please note this only moves issues which could be resolved by underground parking within the footprint of new builds onto nearby roads)

c) The lazy solution of double yellow lines to resolve an issue which if some creative time was applied to the issue would result in different and varied solutions

d) Short sighted resolution of "Harper Road" issue without reference to the Borough High Street/Great Dover Street/New Kent Road triangle and the impact

e) Prioritisation of Cyclists over residents who pay council tax/rent

f) Ineffective monitoring of entertainment licences in particular the Ministry of Sound and the Coronet

I have lately not engaged in numerous emails by concerned residents about the Harper road traffic (by various residents on or around Harper Road). However the farce of consultation that is currently ongoing and having read the notices I have come to the conclusion that common sense will not prevail and I have to object
BATH TERRACE - to convert existing single yellow line restrictions to 'at any time' waiting restrictions on both sides at its junction with Rockingham Street;

HARPER ROAD - to convert existing single yellow line restrictions to 'at any time' waiting restrictions on both sides between its junction with Falmouth Road and the southern wall of Globe Academy primary school;

ROCKINGHAM STREET - to convert existing single yellow line restrictions to 'at any time' waiting restrictions (i) on both sides between its junctions with Newington Causeway and Tiverton Street, (ii) on the north-east side at its junction with Tiverton Street, (iii) on the north-east side at its junction with Tarn Street, (iv) on the north-east side at its junction with Bath Terrace, (v) on the north-east side at its junction with the vehicle access to Aird House, (vi) on both sides between its junction with Meadow Row and the vehicle access to Martin House, and (vii) to provide a new permit holders' parking place on the north-east side outside Aird House, and (viii) to extend an existing 'shared-use' parking place on the north-east side outside Rankine House and No. 15 Rockingham Street;

TARN STREET - to convert existing single yellow line restrictions to 'at any time' waiting restrictions on both sides at its junction with Rockingham Street;

TIVERTON STREET - to convert existing single yellow line restrictions to 'at any time' waiting restrictions on both sides at its junction with Rockingham Street;

The above sounds like an attempt to create a lifeless community bounded by fast moving vehicles with limited regard for residents and the community which includes Church/Mosque attendees and after school activities at Globe and including whatever is happening to Dickens Square.

To say I am disappointed in the activity is an understatement. For other reasons …… but this latest design to turn the Rockingham Estate and Harper Road into a Ghetto confirms my decision.

Please note that this is an objection to all the proposed changes. I would also want to know what the cost of all the changes are going to be and please do not tell me that it is within budget as that response will only further confirm my sentiments.

Thanking you in advance for your attention. I do not think I need to remind you that you have a duty to represent your residents but I will do it for completeness.
Local parking amendment
Determination of statutory objection

Reference: 16/17_Q1_002

**Location overview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Location overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/17_Q1_002</td>
<td>Harper Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**
To Install double yellow lines on the east and northeast side and the southwest side to improve traffic flow and access at any time.

**Community council meeting**
Borough, Bankside and Walworth

**Community council date**
5 October 2016

**Ward(s) affected**
Chaucer

**Background**
At the community council meeting held on 29 June 2016, Members approved this proposal subject to the outcome of statutory consultation.

The proposal originates from a resident who raised concerns that the Academy occasionally holds functions during the evenings and at weekends, as a result more vehicles are parking in Harper Road, some of which are parking dangerously or inconsiderately on the existing single yellow line restriction.

This type of parking activity can pose a safety risk to all road users.

Harper Road is part of the Newington (D) controlled parking zone which operated Monday to Friday 8.30am – 6.30pm. It is within walking distance of music venue and a nightclub and with the CPZ not operating after 6.30pm allows vehicles to park on single yellow lines making the street an attractive parking location for non-residents.

Statutory consultation was carried out between 18 August 2016 and 08 September 2016. During this period, the council received eight objections.

Paragraph 16 of Part 3H of the Southwark Constitution sets out that the community council will take decisions on the following local non-strategic matters:

- determination of objections to traffic management orders that do not relate to strategic or borough-wide issues

**Summary of objection(s)**
The objections received is attached to this report and can be summarised as:

- That Harper Road is possibly being used at a main route instead of Elephant and Castle junction
- Noise and pollution
- Harper Road is used as a Truck and Bus hub
- Vehicle speeds are increasing
- Removing off peak parking

Officers wrote to the objectors acknowledging receipt of their representation. They were also advised that their objection would be sent to the Borough, Bankside and Walworth community council for determination.
**Recommendation and next steps**

It is recommended that the objections made against the proposal to the introduction of double yellow lines are introduced on the north and south sides adjacent to the width restriction and on the east side be considered and rejected.

The council do not consider this part of the road suitable for parking. The current single yellow lines restrictions mean that parking can only take place late in the evening and on the weekends. The double yellow line restriction will be no longer than current single yellow line.

With this section of road being on a slight bend, close to a pedestrian crossing, vehicle width restrictions, pedestrian refuges and road chevrons reduces the highway to a single carriageway in both directions, it is clearly unsuitable to accommodate parking at any time.

**Objection 1**

Dear team,

I'd like to express my deep concern regarding the possibility to use Harper road as a main route to Old Kent road. We have in the past months seen a substantial increase of traffic including HGV, vans, trailers, coaches and buses not in service, not only during day time but up until late at night.

The noise pollution is really inconvenient, to the point where we have to close the windows to have a conversation or watch the TV as trucks, trailers and HGV's loads rattle considerably as they drive over humps.

Even opening the windows to let fresh air has become painful.

More than often long coaches can hardly squeeze between the traffic islands parked and parked cars.

This also increases the level of air pollution and H&S issues. Indeed, there is also a high level of pedestrian traffic on Harper Road since not only there are a lots of flats, but there are also a reception, a primary and a secondary school, a surgery, two small parks with sport facility and a mosque.

As a resident of Harper road I am strongly oppose to any decision that will increase the traffic on our road and will support any decision to reduce it.

**Objection 2**

Dear Sir/ Madam

Good day

We do not want Harper road turned into a bus and truck Hub with its associated noise and risk to health. We are prepared and willing to fight for this position to its logical conclusion Best Regards

The email you received and any files transmitted with it are confidential, may be covered by legal and/or professional privilege and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this in error please notify us immediately. If you are not the intended recipient of the email or the person responsible for delivering it to them you may not copy it, forward it or otherwise use it for any purpose or disclose its contents to any other person. To do so may be unlawful. Where opinions are expressed in the email they are not necessarily those of Southwark Council and Southwark Council is not responsible for any changes made to the message after it has been sent.

**Objection 3**


Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to protest the plan to use Harper Road as the main connection for the New Kent Road, following the recent changes at Elephant and Castle roundabout.

I bought my 1st floor property on Harper road three years ago. What attracted me to Harper Road, was that it is a quiet residential road with a school. Recently I have been constantly woken up at night and interrupted during the day by the increased number of vehicles driving down Harper road. This includes HGVs, off duty buses, coaches, articulated lorries and a significantly increased number of cars and bikes plowing down the road (often above the speed limit - especially at night!) and who fly over the speed humps directly outside my property creating loud crashing noises when they land again and disrupting my sleep and quality of living.

I have been told that the plan is to make this, once quiet road, into the main connection. I would like to protest against this plan. I am also aware that you are planning to replace the single yellow lines, with double yellow lines, removing all parking from the road at any time. I am also strongly against this. We are unable to apply for council resident parking permits, as we are a new build property. My boyfriend frequently travels from Uxbridge to visit me at my home. At the moment if he is able to park on the single yellow lines, however, if they change to double yellow lines, he will be unable to do so and public transport takes too long for him to be able to get to work on time. (At the moment he has to leave before 7am to get out of the congestion charge zone).

I am adamantly against this proposal to put Harper Road as the main connection and to replace the single yellow lines with double yellow lines. This will greatly affect my standard of living (as it has already been proven with the increased traffic noise). It will also put all the children at Globe Academy school at a greater risk of being knocked over.

Please put my name down as a protest against this H/ND/TMO1617-013 proposal.

**Objection 4**

Dear Southwark Council,

I live in the recently constructed Dawkins court development. We were informed that due to the changes in the Elephant and Castle round about, the intention was to use Harper Road as an alternative route to New Kent Road (H/ND/TMO1617-013).

This is a residential area with a primary and secondary school and several parks. To use Harper Road as the alternative route, will not only make more difficult, the already challenging parking situation for the residents, but more importantly it will pose a hazard to all the children commuting to and from the school and playgrounds. The speed bumps are in place for a reason.

Furthermore, the use of Harper Road is particularly strange as there is an existing alternative for the majority of the traffic via Great Dover street and New Kent Road itself.

I firmly oppose this action and will expect that should this action be approved that Southwark council will take legal and financial responsibility for all related accidents that occur on this road.

**Objection 5**

Dear Sir

I am writing in my capacity as Chair of the Trinity Newington Residents' Association ("TNRA"). TNRA was formed in 1976 for the residents of Newington Trust Estate in London, SE1 (now rebranded as Trinity Village). This consists of Trinity Church Square ("TCS"), Merrick Square and Bedford Row, and parts of
Cole Street, Falmouth Road, Swan Street and Trinity Street. TNRA’s paid up membership each year is over 200 households, comprising around 400 individuals.

We object to the proposal in these traffic orders relating to Harper Road viz to convert existing single yellow line restrictions to ‘at any time’ waiting restrictions on both sides between its junction with Falmouth Road and the southern wall of Globe Academy primary school.

As you should be aware, local residents are in discussion with our councillors (copied in) and Cllr Ian Wingfield (Cabinet Member for Environment & the Public Realm) to identify measures that could slow down HGVs and other traffic and discourage them from using Harper Road and the surrounding area as a rat run.

The proposal in this traffic order will have the opposite effect – it will remove parked traffic and make Harper Road a more attractive, obstacle free route for HGVs to speed along.

Please can the proposed changes to Harper Road in this traffic order be withdrawn/put on hold until the broader strategy of how best to address heavy traffic in Harper Road and the surrounding area is resolved.

**Objection 6**

I would like to lodge an objection with regard to the proposed changes to Harper Road.

I am a resident of a ground floor/1st floor maisonette in Newall House in Harper Road and I am Treasurer of the Rockingham Tenants and Residents Association. I object to the proposed order on the basis of my personal experience and on the basis of discussions with other residents of my estate.

The consultation on these changes has not been adequately conducted. The order was issued on 18th August with a closing date for objections on 8th September. This is during the peak holiday period making it difficult to canvas opinions, especially from non-resident users of the area affected by the proposed double yellow lines - the Globe Academy pupils, parents and the people attending the churches and other weekend activities that take place on the site. I am also very concerned that while our Council members raised the yellow line proposals for Rockingham St at TRA meetings no mention was made of the Harper Road proposals. Further, the consultation does not seem to have taken into account ongoing discussions about the increase in traffic that has occurred since the alterations to the Elephant junction and the attendant road safety issues. It is bizarre that there has not been one process to look at the traffic conditions and safety in one road. It is even more concerning that the two processes seem to be at odds with each other - one is about easing the flow of traffic while the other is about reducing the flow.

Removing off-peak parking from the section of Harper Road nearer to the New Kent Road represents a significant loss of amenity to users of the Globe Academy at the weekend and in the evenings. In particular this affects people attending church services and related events.

Removing off-peak parking from that section of Harper Road will cause people who currently park there to move their vehicles to other parts of Harper Road and to adjacent roads and on to the Rockingham estate. Parking at the other end of the road is already under pressure due to the mosque and to the low number of parking spaces on the estate.

Adding double yellow lines will give the message to drivers that this a road through which they should be moving speedily. This is at odds with the residential nature of the road, with the presence of the school, the mosque and the three parks, and at odds with the existing, inadequate measures to reduce the flow of traffic.

The incident which seems to have given rise to the concern about road safety could equally well be resolved by the proposal to restrict the type of vehicles using the road and by the enforcement (or reduction and enforcement) of the 20mph speed limit. There were no incidents like this before the changes at the Elephant led to an increase in
commercial and heavy goods vehicles using Harper Road. Therefore it is wrong to enact a partial measure before the situation of the road as a whole has been properly considered.

I will be pleased to provide further information in support of this objection if that would be helpful.

Yours sincerely

Objection 7

For the attention of the Traffic Orders Officer, Highways, Southwark Council,

Attached is my letter covering my objections regarding the proposed changes to Harper Road.

The letter goes into some detail but as I am copying in my local councillors and MP, I feel it appropriate to provide a short summary of my objections for their information.

Considering the fact that the Traffic Management Order containing the proposed change was issued on the 18th of August and was not made known to local residents I feel that the deadline for objections set at 8th September to be unreasonable.

The three aspects of my Objections are as follows:

- There has been no proper consultation with residents and other interested parties with regard to this proposed change and the timescale employed in its implementation removes all opportunities to carry out any proper consultation therefore it must be stopped.
- Its purposes do not stand up to examination because the measure does not take into consideration the context and the range of serious issues currently being discussed regarding Harper Road as a whole. Its implementation would, at best seriously hinder other measures being discussed and would most likely add to the problems already being experienced on the road.
- Removing off-peak parking from this section of the road would constitute a major withdrawal of current amenities enjoyed by a range of local people throughout the week and would have seriously negative implications that extended well beyond the road itself.

Please contact me if you require further details regarding my Objection

Thank you

Objection 8

In February I raised this issue with you on the understanding that you would endeavor to resolve the issue in a way that would benefit residents. You and your colleagues support for residents has been at best lukewarm given the

1) Lack of real resolution to traffic incidence on Harper Road
2) Lack of meaningful consultation
at worst irresponsible given the solutions

1) Double yellow lines
2) More Traffic through Harper Road

You as our representative should be able to effectively represent us and that would mean protecting what we have or enhancing what we have as a community. I do not expect council workers to represent me or understand my requirements but I do expect elected councilors to represent the community that voted for them rather than follow policies that are going to blight the lives of residents based on ideology.

The policies I mention above would include
a) Allowing TfL to blight the lives of local Residents by rerouting traffic away from Elephant castle "roundabout" experiment

b) Engaging in a life-threatening ideology about no parking in new builds when we need car parking spaces (Please note this only moves issues which could be resolved by underground parking within the footprint of new builds onto nearby roads)

c) The lazy solution of double yellow lines to resolve an issue which if some creative time was applied to the issue would result in different and varied solutions

d) Short sighted resolution of "Harper Road" issue without reference to the Borough High Street/Great Dover Street/New Kent Road triangle and the impact

e) Prioritisation of Cyclists over residents who pay council tax/rent

f) Ineffective monitoring of entertainment licences in particular the Ministry of Sound and the Coronet

I have lately not engaged in numerous emails by concerned residents about the Harper road traffic (by various residents on or around Harper Road). However the farce of consultation that is currently ongoing and having read the notices I have come to the conclusion that common sense will not prevail and I have to object

BATH TERRACE - to convert existing single yellow line restrictions to 'at any time' waiting restrictions on both sides at its junction with Rockingham Street;

HARPER ROAD - to convert existing single yellow line restrictions to 'at any time' waiting restrictions on both sides between its junction with Falmouth Road and the southern wall of Globe Academy primary school;

ROCKINGHAM STREET - to convert existing single yellow line restrictions to 'at any time' waiting restrictions (i) on both sides between its junctions with Newington Causeway and Tiverton Street, (ii) on the north-east side at its junction with Tiverton Street, (iii) on the north-east side at its junction with Tarn Street, (iv) on the north-east side at its junction with Bath Terrace, (v) on the north-east side at its junction with the vehicle access to Aird House, (vi) on both sides between its junction with Meadow Row and the vehicle access to Martin House, and (vii) to provide a new permit holders' parking place on the north-east side outside Aird House, and (viii) to extend an existing 'shared-use' parking place on the north-east side outside Rankine House and No. 15 Rockingham Street;

TARN STREET - to convert existing single yellow line restrictions to 'at any time' waiting restrictions on both sides at its junction with Rockingham Street;

TIVERTON STREET - to convert existing single yellow line restrictions to 'at any time' waiting restrictions on both sides at its junction with Rockingham Street;

The above sounds like an attempt to create a lifeless community bounded by fast moving vehicles with limited regard for residents and the community which includes Church/Mosque attendees and after school activities at Globe and including whatever is happening to Dickens Square.

To say I am disappointed in the activity is an understatement. For other …… but this latest design to turn the Rockingham Estate and Harper Road into a Ghetto confirms my decision.

Please note that this is an objection to all the proposed changes. I would also want to know what the cost of all the changes are going to be and please do not tell me that it is within budget as that response will only further confirm my sentiments

Thanking you in advance for your attention. I do not think I need to remind you that you have a duty to represent your residents but I will do it for completeness
Legend
- Proposed double yellow lines
- Existing double red lines
- Existing single red line
- Existing double yellow lines
- Existing single yellow line
- Existing permit holders only
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## Local parking amendment

### Location overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>16/17_Q3_006</th>
<th>Location: Walworth Road j/w Heygate Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal</strong></td>
<td>To install a yellow box marking on Walworth Road at the junction with Heygate Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community council meeting</strong></td>
<td>Borough, Bankside and Walworth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community council date</strong></td>
<td>5 October 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ward(s) affected</strong></td>
<td>Newington, East Walworth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local parking amendment

A local parking amendment (LPA) is a small project to change an existing parking restriction or to introduce a new one. These tend to be carried out in locations where we have had a request to look at dangerous or obstructive parking and where small lengths of restrictions could provide a solution.

However, in this case, the LPA relates to offences relating to moving traffic.

**Request**

As part of their Road Modernisation Programme, Transport for London (TfL) has identified several locations where improvements to the highway would reduce bus journey times.

A potential intervention was identified at the above location, install a yellow box at the junction of Heygate Street and Walworth Road, to prohibit the blocking of right-turning vehicles out of Heygate Street.

**Location**

The proposed measure is at the junction of Heygate Street and Walworth Road.

**Investigation and conclusions**

TfL have reported that their data shows that the 136 and 343 bus routes are experiencing delays due to queuing northbound traffic blocking the right turn from Heygate Street into Walworth Road.

Officers believe that this intervention would also improve egress out of Steedman Street, as well as for cyclists entering Steedman Street.

**Recommendation**

Officers recommend that the Community Council approves the implementation of the yellow box junction.

A detailed design drawing of the proposal is provided within this document.

**Next steps**

Should the community council approve this local parking amendment, the council will make arrangements to install the yellow box junction.

Statutory consultation is not required for yellow box junctions.
NOTES

1. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE IN METRES UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED.
2. THIS DRAWING IS TO BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH ALL COMONY ACCOMPANIED DRAWINGS FOR JOB REF. C0306 AS LISTED ON THE SCHEME DOCUMENT ISSUE SHEET.
3. TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT IS TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH CHAPTER 8 OF THE TRAFFIC SIGNS MANUAL AND SAFETY AT STREET WORKS AND ROAD WORKS.
4. CONTRACTOR TO MAINTAIN ACCESS TO ALL PROPERTIES AND BUSINESSES AT ALL TIMES.
5. ALL ROAD MARKINGS AND SIGNS ARE TO BE INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DFT TRAFFIC SIGNS MANUAL - CHAPTER 2.2003.
6. ALL ROAD MARKINGS AND SIGNS ARE TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TRAFFIC SIGNS REGULATIONS & GENERAL DIRECTIONS (TSRGD) 2016.
7. ALL PROPORTIONS AND FORM OF LETTERS, NUMERALS, AND OTHER CHARACTERS ARE TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH SCHEDULE 17 OF THE TSRGD 2016.

KEYS:
- Existing road markings to be removed.
- Proposed road marking.
- Road marking reference. Refer to road marking schedule in Table 1.
- Existing manhole cover
- Existing gully

TABLE 1 - ROAD MARKING SCHEDULE (TSRGD 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF NO.</th>
<th>DWG NO</th>
<th>MARK MM</th>
<th>GAP (MM)</th>
<th>WIDTH (MM)</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>COLOUR</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>&quot;EXCEPT BUSES&quot; MARKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>&quot;BUS LANE&quot; MARKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>INTERMITTENT</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>BUS LANE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>PRIMROSE YELLOW</td>
<td>YELLO W BOX JUNCTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1200 SERIES - ROAD MARKINGS AND SIGNS 12.2 (WALWORTH ROAD / HEYGATE STREET JUNCTION)
RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council comment upon the consultation findings and the following recommendation:

   - Make no changes to the existing operational times (Monday to Friday, 8.30am to 6.30pm) of the Borough (C2) parking zone.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. In accordance with Part 3H paragraph 23 and 25 of the Southwark Constitution, community councils are to be consulted on the detail of strategic parking/traffic/safety schemes. In practice this is carried out following public consultation.

3. In accordance with Part 3D paragraphs 22 and 24 of the council’s constitution the decision to implement a new or amended strategic transport scheme lies with the individual cabinet member for environment and public realm.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

4. The strategic parking project programme included a review a section of the Borough (C2) parking zone to assess the times of operation of that part of the zone, in response to concerns that the new Castle Centre may have the potential to increase parking demand in nearby streets outside of the existing zone hours.

5. Following approval of the programme but in advance of public consultation, a report was presented to Borough Bankside and Walworth Community Council\(^1\) on 30 January 2016. This report set out the proposed consultation methods and boundaries. At the meeting, councillors stated their preferred option was for a full review of the C2 CPZ, to include the whole CPZ area.

6. Full details of the consultation strategy, results, options and analysis can be found in the “Borough (C2) parking review consultation report” (Appendix 1) but the key issues are summarised in the following paragraphs.

7. Informal public consultation took place with all residents and businesses within the C2 parking zone from 4 July 2016 until 5 August 2016.

8. The informal public consultation yielded 221 returned questionnaires from within the consultation area, representing a 3.6% response rate.

9. Figure 1 details the overall response to the headline questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>During what times would you like C2 parking zone to operate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borough (C2) CPZ</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>Monday to Friday: 71% - No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Saturday: 55% - No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sunday: 56% - No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21% - Evening: 11% - Morning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9% - Other: 28% - All day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6% - Other: 6% - Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1

Conclusions

10. There was no widespread support to change the times of operation on weekdays (Monday to Friday) in the Borough (C2) parking zone.

11. There was no widespread support to change the times of operation to include Saturdays in the Borough (C2) parking zone.

12. There was no widespread support to change the times of operation to include Sundays in the Borough (C2) parking zone.

13. The review identified some locations within the zone where modifications are considered necessary to improve parking layouts. Officers will review the existing waiting and parking restrictions within the zone and will consider comments made through the informal consultation.

14. The aim will be to increase parking where safe to do so and upgrade existing single yellow lines to double yellow lines where parking is unsafe. Any proposals will be presented to a future community council meeting through the local parking amendments process.

Policy implications

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

   Policy 1.1 – pursue overall traffic reduction
   Policy 4.2 – create places that people can enjoy
   Policy 8.1 – seek to reduce overall levels of private motor vehicle traffic on our streets.

Community impact statement

16. The implementation of any transport project creates a range of community impacts. All transport schemes aim to improve the safety and security of vulnerable groups and support economic development by improving the overall transport system and access to it.

17. The introduction of yellow lines at junctions gives benefit to all road users through the improvement of inter-visibility and therefore road safety.
18. There is a risk that new restrictions may cause parking to be displaced and, indirectly, have an adverse impact upon road users and neighboring properties at that location. However this cannot be entirely preempted until the recommendations have been implemented and observed.

19. With the exception of those benefits and risks identified above, the recommendations are not considered to have a disproportionate affect on any other community group.

20. The recommendations support the council’s equalities and human rights policies and promote social inclusion by:
   - Providing improved access for key services such as emergency and refuge vehicles.
   - Improving road safety, in particular for vulnerable road users, on the public highway.

**Resource implications**

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

**Legal implications**

22. Traffic Management Orders would be made under powers contained within the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTRA) 1984.

23. Should the recommendations be approved the council will give notice of its intention to make a traffic order in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

24. These regulations also require the council to consider any representations received as a result of publishing the draft order for a period of 21 days following publication of the draft order.

25. Should any objections be received they must be properly considered in the light of administrative law principles, human rights law and the relevant statutory powers.

26. By virtue of section 122, the council must exercise its powers under the RTRA 1984 so as to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic including pedestrians, and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway.

27. These powers must be exercised so far as practicable having regard to the following matters:

   a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises;
   b) the effect on the amenities of any locality affected including the regulation and restriction of heavy commercial traffic so as to preserve or improve amenity;
   c) the national air quality strategy;
d) facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and securing the safety and convenience of their passengers; and
e) any other matters appearing to the council to be relevant.

Consultation

28. The community council was consulted prior to commencement of the study.

29. Informal public consultation was carried out in July and August 2016, as detailed above.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Papers</th>
<th>Held At</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

APPENDICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 1</td>
<td>Borough (C2) parking zone review consultation report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUDIT TRAIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Officer</th>
<th>Report Author</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Dated</th>
<th>Key Decision?</th>
<th>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew Hill, Highways Programme Manager</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>16 September 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>Officer Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan Fish, Project Engineer / Paul Gellard, Senior Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Law and Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Director of Finance and Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cabinet Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In response to feedback from local residents, the Council consulted within the Borough (C2) CPZ area to determine if changes should be made to meet local need.
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The primary aim of the review is to determine if there is a need to extend the existing operational times of the CPZ.

The Borough (C2) zone currently operates between Monday and Friday, from 8.30am to 6.30pm. Outside of these times, i.e. in the evenings and at weekends, any motorist can park in the street.

Summary of key consultation findings

The parking review study yielded a low response rate of 3.6%. This in itself does not provide the Council with a strong mandate to make operational changes to the zone.

A street-by-street review of the consultation responses shows that only 3 streets merit further consideration for extended operational times: Brook Drive, Hayles Street and Oswin Street. However as these streets are not geographically connected, there is no logical boundary for a proposed new sub zone. It is also not good parking practice to have streets within a zone operating at different times as this could cause confusion amongst motorists.

The C2 zone is continuing to see pressure for parking space. This is due to a combination of new developments, increasing business and resident population, as well as visitors and deliveries to the area. While there has been a substantial change to the demographics in the area, the available kerbside space has remained the same.

Although there is clearly little support to change the operational times of the zone, a large number of design comments were received during the informal consultation requesting that the council maximise parking wherever possible, to increase the chances of residents finding a parking space.

Within the C2 parking zone all kerbside space has been allocated and prioritised with either parking bays or yellow line restrictions. The council will review the layout of the parking and will extend existing parking places and introduce new ones wherever is safe. In some areas, it may be necessary to upgrade existing single yellow lines to double yellow (no waiting at any time) where there are safety concerns (for example at junctions).

Recommendations

- To make no changes to the operational times of the C2 CPZ
- To consider the comments made relating to the existing parking layout and make proposal to increase parking spaces wherever possible safe to do so. Any proposals will be presented to a future community council meeting through the local parking amendments process.
Introduction

Background

The introduction of the new Castle Centre facilities is likely to increase the amount of parking in the area. An initial proposal was made to Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council to consult in the area of the Borough ‘C2’ CPZ to the south of St George’s Road to determine if residents in the area close to the new leisure centre felt that changes to the operation of the CPZ would be needed.

Following review by Community Council, Southwark Council made the decision to extend the consultation boundary to include the whole ‘C2’ CPZ area.

Consultation commenced at the start of July 2016. A5 post cards including contact details for the Southwark Project Officer and a link to the consultation via the Council website were distributed to 6215 properties in the ‘C2’ CPZ area (addresses obtained from the Local Land and Property Gazetteer (LLPG) for Southwark). The website link led to an online questionnaire asking respondents if they wanted to change the hours of operation for their zone.

A copy of the post card and additional consultation materials made available on the Southwark website is included in Appendix A, including a list of the questions included in the on-line questionnaire.

The original end date for the consultation was 29 July 2016. This was extended by one week to 5 August.

A timeline showing previous reviews and indicative dates for further activities is shown in Figure 1.

---

Figure 1 – Borough ‘C2’ timeline

1974 CPZ ‘C’ introduced
2001 CPZ ‘C’ review • Split into ‘C1’ and ‘C2’
2006 ‘C2’ review • Minor changes to parking
January 2016 Consultation methods and boundary discussed at Community Council
July 2016 Consultation commences • Publicity including leaflets, street notices and social media
August 2016 Consultation closed • Analysis of results
October 2016 Report and recommendations to be presented to Community Council
Winter 2016 Final decision • Publication of final report
### Consultation results

#### Summary

The following summarises the key results of the consultation, including the response rate and a breakdown of whether changes to the operational times of the Borough (C2) CPZ are wanted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>... the overall response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>▪ 95% of these responses were received from residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Only 11 out of 96 streets achieved a &gt;10% response rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ No responses were received from 48 out of 96 streets consulted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### During what times would you like C2 parking zone to operate? – Monday to Friday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>71%</th>
<th>...of respondents would like to see <strong>no change to the parking restrictions during Monday to Friday</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ 21% of respondents supported evening controls during Monday to Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ No individual street showed substantial support for the C2 parking zone to operate in the evenings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### During what times would you like C2 parking zone to operate? – Saturday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>55%</th>
<th>...of respondents would like to see <strong>no change to the parking on a Saturday</strong>, i.e. remain free and unrestricted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ 11% of respondents would like Saturday morning controls introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ 27% of respondents would like Saturday controls to be introduced operating all-day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Only Brook Drive, Oswin Street and Hayles Street showed moderate support for Saturday controls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### During what times would you like C2 parking zone to operate? – Sunday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>56%</th>
<th>...of respondents would like to see <strong>no change to the parking on a Sunday</strong>, i.e. remain free and unrestricted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ 9% of respondents would like Sunday morning controls introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ 24% of respondents would like Sunday controls to be introduced operating all-day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Only Brook Drive and Oswin Street showed moderate support for Sunday controls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response rate

The consultation closed on 5 August 2016. Public access to the online form was removed at close of play on this date.

Officers then verified the data for the questionnaire responses to ensure that only one response per household was received and that all responses received were from an address within the project area. As a result 22 responses have been omitted from the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation returns</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of properties consulted</td>
<td>6215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of responses</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of duplicate responses</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of responses received from outside the consultation boundary</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of responses included in the analysis</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – consultation returns

A total of 221 valid review responses have been received, representing a 3.6% response rate. This is an average response rate for a CPZ review when compared with similar consultations in the borough and across London.

The overall response rate is partially skewed by low response levels from the high density main arterial routes with extensive parking controls (Transport for London Route Network (TLRN), Strategic Route Network (SRN) and Principal Borough Roads (PBR)) with large numbers of property addresses.

The council gives significant weighting to the consultation return when the response rate exceeds a threshold of 10%. Where the response rate does not reach this 10% threshold, a lower weighting is given to the consultation results, with other local information sources, such as future development, parking studies, the likely impact of surrounding parking controls and community council opinion, given additional weight.

It is not clear as to how the low level of response may be attributed. It could be that residents’ are overall satisfied with the local parking provision and existing council or private housing permit schemes, satisfaction with the proposals, apathy towards the proposals that may not directly affect them or problems associated with communication.

Comments

Respondents were also given the opportunity to provide feedback on the current design of the Borough (C2) CPZ area in question 4. These responses (with any identifying information redacted) are provided in Appendix C. In question 3, consultees were asked to state if they would like to see new bicycle hangers, car club bays or trees introduced into their road. Responses are included in the tables in Appendix B. Some design changes are to be made based on these comments – these will be put forward to a future Community Council meeting.
Key question - headline responses

Question 2 ‘During what times would you like the C2 parking zone to operate?’ is considered to be the key question for this study.

A summary of the results from the eleven streets where the response rate was higher than ten per cent is given in Table 2 including the most common responses to question 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road name</th>
<th>No of properties</th>
<th>No of responses</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>Monday to Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austral Street</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkham Terrace</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>All day (100%)</td>
<td>No clear majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clennam Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Evening (100%)</td>
<td>Morning (100%)</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidge Street</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Street</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No clear majority</td>
<td>All day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmsworth Mews</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>All day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayles Street</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>All day (55%)</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milcote Street</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>All day</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswin Street</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>No clear majority</td>
<td>All day (64%)</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trundle Street</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Square</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>378</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – Most popular responses to question 2 from streets with a response rate higher than ten per cent

Only Clennam Street responded in favour of changes between Monday and Friday. However, this represents only one response and should not be considered sufficient for action. While there were streets that did respond in favour of Saturday or Sunday controls, these either represent a low number of responses, or do not form a logical geographic boundary suitable for inclusion as a sub-zone within the C2 boundary.
Response rate by area

The overall response rate for this consultation is 3.6%.

Further, street-by-street analysis to identify a core area shows that the section of the Borough C2 area south of St George’s Road has a higher response of 13.4%. However, there is still no significant support for change to the operational hours in these streets.
Area bounded by Lambeth and St George’s Road

The detailed analysis showed the higher response rates come from a network of streets to the south of the zone. The results for these streets have been further analysed to determine if there is any justification for changes to the operational times for this section of the Borough (C2) CPZ.

The eight roads shown in Figure 2, plan B, form a logical core area and demonstrate a response rate of 13.4%.

No road responded in favour of changes in zonal operating times during weekdays.

Oswin Street and Hayles Street both have a response rate of higher than ten per cent and show a majority in favour of all day Saturday and all day Sunday controls.

However, when looked at as a group of roads in geographic proximity, there is no majority in in favour of changes to the times of operation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road name</th>
<th>No of properties</th>
<th>No of responses</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
<th>Monday to Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austral Street</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Drive</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>All day (53%)</td>
<td>All day (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliotts Row</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No clear majority</td>
<td>No clear majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmsworth Mews</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayles Street</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>All day (55%)</td>
<td>All day (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orient Street</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswin Street</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>No clear majority</td>
<td>All day (64%)</td>
<td>All day (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Square</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No clear majority</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>610</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
<td><strong>No clear majority</strong></td>
<td><strong>No clear majority</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

A majority (78%) of respondents provided additional comments in response to question 4. Some of these comments included suggestions for improvement or modification to the existing parking layout. These are presented in Appendix C.

Comments received outside the informal consultation

Councillor Noakes recorded comments from residents in the Borough (C2) area. These comments are presented in Appendix D. Although these do not give significant weight to our recommendation, we will be considering design comments as we realise the importance of maximising parking space wherever safely possible.
Conclusions

The overall low response rate of 3.6% provides the Council with no mandate to make changes to the operational times of the Borough C2 zone.

Street-by-street analysis does show that a number of streets demonstrated a response rate of higher than ten per cent, with a generally higher response rate from streets to the south of St George’s Road. However, even for these streets, there is no substantial majority in favour of change to the operational times of the zone.

Recommendations

No changes should be made to the operating times of the Borough (C2) CPZ.

Comments regarding the design and layout of parking have are being reviewed by Southwark Council officers.

Any proposed parking amendments aim to:

- Maximise parking where we can;
- Upgrade single yellow lines to double yellow lines, where it is unsafe to park;
- Review the provision of specialised parking places such as disabled bays, car club bays etc.
- Address specific concerns raised during consultation

Any proposed parking amendments based on these comments, engineering best practice and officer judgement will be presented to a future community council meeting through the local parking amendments process.
Distribution

A5 post cards providing notice of the consultation, a link to the location of the questionnaire on the Southwark Council website and contact details for the parking project team were sent to some 6215 addresses by second class post.

Thumbnails of the front and back of the post card are shown as Figure A1.

Street notices

The council put up street notices, shown as Figure A2, on street lighting columns at over 60 locations across the Borough (C2) CPZ area.

Figure A2—Street notice
The survey was undertaken using an on-line survey, with questions as shown below.
The tables included in this appendix consist of an analysis and summary of the consultation returns to the Borough (C2) parking study. Note that streets from which no responses were received are not listed.

### Responses to Question 1 'Are you a Resident or a Business?'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>No of responses</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tables included in this appendix consist of an analysis and summary of the consultation returns to the Borough (C2) parking study.
This table details street-by-street what times they would like the C2 parking zone to operate Monday to Friday.

Response to Question 2 - During what times would you like C2 parking zone to operate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Midday</th>
<th>Afternoon</th>
<th>Evening</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>No Clear Majority</th>
<th>No Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weller Street</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webber Row</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George’s Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamesbridge Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark Bridge Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheaf Street</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Street</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Street</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poleta Street</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimlico Street</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Street</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth Street</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pemberton Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke Street</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland Square</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfield Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North London Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lambeth Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood Street</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notting Hill Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notting Hill Street</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lambeth Street</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland Street</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfleet Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfleet Street</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland Square</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfield Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lambeth Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwood Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwood Street</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood Street</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notting Hill Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notting Hill Street</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lambeth Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland Square</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfield Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfield Street</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lambeth Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland Square</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfield Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfield Street</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lambeth Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland Square</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfield Road</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfield Street</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table details street by street what times they would like the C2 parking zone to operate on a Saturday.

**Responses to Question 2 – “During what times would you like C2 parking zone to operate?”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Saturday Morning</th>
<th>Saturday Afternoon</th>
<th>All Day</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>Properties responses rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No clear majority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No clear majority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows the percentage of respondents for each street for different time slots. The results are given for Saturday morning, Saturday afternoon, and all day. The properties responses rate is also provided.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road name</th>
<th>No of change</th>
<th>No of response</th>
<th>All day</th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Afternoon</th>
<th>Evening</th>
<th>No clear majority</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Square</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weller Street</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webber Street</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webber Row</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo Road</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trundle Street</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Georges Road</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark Bridge Road</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushworth Street</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcross Way</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess Street</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole Street</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oval Street</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Street</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holborn Street</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holborn Square</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Bench Street</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Cross Street</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Edward Walk</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth Bridge</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth High Street</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfriars Road</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfriars High Street</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough (C2)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough (All day)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough (C2)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough (All day)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough (C2)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough (All day)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough (C2)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough (All day)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table details street-by-street what times they would like the C2 parking zone to operate on a Sunday.

Responses to Question 2 – “During what times would you like C2 parking zone to operate?”
### Street names

- Southwark Bridge Road
- Sanctuary Street
- Rushworth Street
- Redcross Way
- Princess Street
- Oswin Street
- Orient Street
- Marshalsea Road
- London Road
- Lancaster Street
- Kings Bench Street
- King Edward Walk
- Hayles Street
- Great Suffolk Street
- Gray Street
- Glasshill Street
- Gerridge Street
- Davidge Street
- Colnbrook Street
- Clennam Street
- Brook
- Borough Road
- Borough High Street
- Barkham Terrace
- Austral Street

### Proportion of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No Or 0</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwark Bridge Road</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctuary Street</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushworth Street</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcross Way</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess Street</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswin Street</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orient Street</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshalsea Road</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Road</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster Street</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Bench Street</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Edward Walk</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayles Street</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other responses

- Trees: 12
- Car club days: 8
- On street bicycle: 1
- Parking: 1

### Comments

The following table shows where respondents indicated that they would like to park.

**Response to question 3**: Would you like us to consider replacing existing parking bays with any of the following?

- Trees
- Car club days
- On street bicycle
- Parking

---

Total responses: 50

No of respondents: 26

Percentage of respondents: 13%
Respondents were invited to provide comments in question 4 of the online form. These comments are listed by street.

**AUSTRAL STREET**

I would like one of the pay-parking places on Austral Street to be changed into a bike locker, not the residential parking as there is not enough of them. The pay-parking bays, which account for all of the parking places on one side of Austral Street, are used often, but are rarely fully used–except at weekends when they are free.

I would like some of the single yellow line areas to be dug up and for trees to be planted there.

Yellow lines to be ok to park on weekends.

I would like the residential visitor passes to be valid in the pay-parking bays.

Additional comments:

- Austral Street is a West Square and a major through route with considerable air pollution. Two of the three suggestions would begin to alleviate that.
- The area suffers from considerable air pollution. Two of the three suggestions would begin to alleviate that.

**AUSTRAL STREET**

Need more parking bays in Austral Street as more residents than pays

Note that not all respondents provided a comment.
AUSTRAL STREET

Plea could you leave the zone exactly how it is. It is very difficult for friends and family to visit us. It is very convenient to be able to park Friday evening through to early Monday morning.

I for one see no reason whatsoever to make any changes. I am strongly against this.

If you must provide for residents than provide us with more resident bays reducing double yellow and single lines. The times has nothing to do with shortage of parking bays.

It is unnecessary changes like this which make life difficult for us residents.

Take for the shambolic modernisation of the elephant castle round about. Totally unnecessary. Traffic jams everywhere, useless bike lanes which are hardly used.

The biggest problem in our area - Lambeth road is coaches parking in residents and car bays - neither paying or caring. They also leave engine idling and cause chaos.

I need more disabled parking bays as there are very few in the area. I live near my children (short street), near the shops (The Cut), our community centre (Scovill Road), near my doctor surgery (Short Street), near the shops (The Cut), our community centre (Scovill Road).

Weber Street needs parking only on one side of the road as it is blocked most days with cars parked on both sides.

The zone works but not anymore parking bays! Logical. Stop widening the pavement. These are more cars than pedestrians. Where are residens supposed to park.

You have removed parking spaces for residents or visitors by changing single yellow to double on Weber street. Stop redcing C2 parking bays. There are now more...
BOROUGH HIGH STREET
Increasing the car club bays, and also the number of electric charging points, would be good for the future. No great numbers needed, but a few.

BOROUGH SQUARE
I live at the top end of the Borough Road, Borough High Street, Newington Causeway end. Could we have more parking this end as at times there is no parking in the area and I have to park in St Georges Circus and carry shopping which is difficult as I'm 74 years old.

BOYFIELD STREET
My main concern is the inability of other drivers who cannot park properly. People who take up two spaces by not using the bays correctly. If the bays were marked into car lengths, this would ensure there is enough space to allow for freedom for visitors and deliveries to be made. (Although not part of this survey, Boyfield Drive is used as a “rat run” by traffic coming from Kennington Road to avoid congestion at Newington Butts; at times there is a steady stream of traffic. Boyfield Drive is not wide enough for two-way passing, so this causes delays. Improvements and increased policing would be very good if the hours of operation to suit day and Sunday)

The increased success of the War Museum since re-opening at weekends, and the increased population on Sundays, means residents cars parked in the side streets which is why I would support extending the parking times on Sundays.

BROOK DRIVE
I often work from home and if I have to leave the house during the day it is usually impossible to get a parking space on returning during the controlled hours.

Sometimes I have to park in Street Away and we are becoming very frustrated when we try to find a way to park our cars.

I have been living in the area for nearly 25 years. In which case I am able to pay in Annual Sticker.

The parking times work well and do not need changing. It allows for freedom for visitors and deliveries to be made.

When the increased success of the War Museum since re-opening at weekends, we see non resident cars parked in the side streets which I do not support.

Over the course of the last few years, I have noticed that it is becoming more and more difficult for us residents to park in our street especially when we are paying our residence parking monthly bases that go up every year.

I hope you'll be able to do something to resolve the problem and been able to park our cars without difficulty.

BROOK DRIVE
The parking spaces on Sundays.

The area is getting very populated with the high-rises going up, the people that are parking to visit the Gym in the afternoons and all the church goers that are feeling the future.

Sometimes we end-up parking our cars streets away and we are becoming very frustrated when we try to find a way to park our cars.

I have been living in the area for nearly 25 years.

Over the course of the last few years, I have noticed that it is becoming more and more difficult for us residents to park in our street especially when we are paying our residence parking monthly bases that go up every year.

I hope you'll be able to do something to resolve the problem and been able to park our cars without difficulty.

BROOK DRIVE
The parking times work well and do not need changing. It allows for freedom for visitors and deliveries to be made.

When the increased success of the War Museum since re-opening at weekends, we see non resident cars parked in the side streets which I do not support.

I have been living in the area for nearly 25 years. In which case I am able to pay in Annual Sticker.

The parking spaces on Sundays.

The area is getting very populated with the high-rises going up, the people that are parking to visit the Gym in the afternoons and all the church goers that are feeling the future.

Sometimes we end-up parking our cars streets away and we are becoming very frustrated when we try to find a way to park our cars.

I have been living in the area for nearly 25 years.

Over the course of the last few years, I have noticed that it is becoming more and more difficult for us residents to park in our street especially when we are paying our residence parking monthly bases that go up every year.

I hope you'll be able to do something to resolve the problem and been able to park our cars without difficulty.
The recent building of the leisure centre and the new blocks of flats, and the impending shopping centre mean that there will be an increased volume of visitors to the area. These visitors are likely to come to the area on evenings and weekends, meaning that residents will lose many parking spots.

In addition, there are many people who attend church on Sunday morning and a vast number of cars and minibuses park in resident bays. Many residents also use rubbish bins to "block" parking spaces - the reason for this, I believe, is because weekend and evening visitors park in spaces that residents would like to use (e.g., within a walking proximity to their houses).

There is a building of the leisure centre and new blocks of flats, and the Meadow Shopping Centre mean that there will be an increased volume of visitors to the area.

Parking in Brook Drive is a particular problem for Sunday parking, and it is for this reason that I have stated no change in the CPZ timing overall.

I understand the concerns of some neighbours at the increasing pressure on parking at the Elephant & Castle, especially on Sunday evenings, which results in pressure on parking at the Elephant & Castle and Brook Drive.

The parking area is particularly difficult at weekends, when many visitors to the IWM use the residents parking bays to park. I would like to see more parking restrictions at weekends for non-residents.

In addition to my worries about more people parking in the area, I also have concerns about the lack of weekend parking for Sunday attenders of the Metropolitan Tabernacle, who cannot find space within their own boundaries to park.

In conclusion, I would like to see a 24/7 CPZ in Brook Drive to prevent residents parking in general to park in evening and weekend bays until Monday morning.

If the C2 zone was extended to the weekend and evenings, then the parking bays would be utilised by residents in the best way.

Many residents also use rubbish bins to "block" parking spaces - the reason for this, I believe, is because weekend and evening visitors park in spaces that residents would like to use (e.g., within a walking proximity to their houses).

In addition, there are many people who attend church on Sunday morning and a vast number of cars and minibuses park in resident bays.
BROOK DRIVE

The street is currently a complete mess: with renegade construction traffic and rat running mixing with a huge volume of cyclists on the cycle superhighway. There’s also a lot of model andlicky parking and school traffic which makes things much worse. Many residents, especially those with young children, are endangered by the fast moving and aggressively driven vehicles using Brook Drive. The road is urgently in need of proper traffic management and calming, including part pedestrianisation, a properly marked and segregated cycle lane, more trees planted so as to slow vehicles. Brook Drive is very close to central London and so is an ideal base from which to cycle into town. More cycle storage and cycle parking would be great.

BROOK DRIVE

I’m in favour for permits to include Saturday’s as I can never get parked near my house resulting in my elderly parents having to walk sometimes the whole of Brook Drive when they come for a visit, and I would like to go food shopping and know I can park somewhere near my house. The other issue about Brook Drive is that it is often used as a ‘rat run’ or cut through for lots of traffic. This has been particularly evident in recent times with all the E&C development works and changes to the roundabouts. Outside of restricted parking hours (weekends for example), vehicles parked between bays on the yellow lines. Since Brook Drive is a 2 way road and can only fit cars going in one direction at a time, with all the pull in / passing gaps filled in by vehicles parked in these areas, the whole street frequently became jammed up and angry drivers refusing / finding it difficult to manoeuvre to allow flow of traffic.

CLENNAAM STREET

I would like the recognised a change to the boundary between C1 and C2. Due to the one way system in place in this area, other than streets (Union, Ayers & Redcross) should be in C2 or all these streets in C2.

BROOK DRIVE

If world a look to add additional bays to the area: the increased traffic from recognised opening in the area (ground Union Street/Pet Iron Square) and spillage from construction traffic which goes west to east through the area.

unnecessary pollution

As there is a larger area in C1, there is a lot of space for the road surface to be extended. However, with traffic being what it is, can take up to 20-30 minutes to bring yourself back into the C2 zone again. There is an additional 10 minutes of unnecessary pollution.

BROOK DRIVE

The street is currently a complete mess: with renegade construction traffic and rat running mixing with a huge volume of cyclists on the cycle superhighway. There’s also a lot of model andlicky parking and school traffic which makes things much worse. Many residents, especially those with young children, are endangered by the fast moving and aggressively driven vehicles using Brook Drive. The road is urgently in need of proper traffic management and calming, including part pedestrianisation, a properly marked and segregated cycle lane, more trees planted so as to slow vehicles. Brook Drive is very close to central London and so is an ideal base from which to cycle into town. More cycle storage and cycle parking would be great.
COLNBROOK STREET

On Colnbrook Street there are very strict parking controls already. The parking tariffs per hour are very steep during the day.

We have operated as a Church and Community Centre for over 12 years in the area and do not see how restricting parking further is justified legally and reasonable taking into account the whole community in the area not just a minority.

The parking bays next to our Church are rarely used. We believe the cost and the congestion charges are sufficient to discourage casual use of cars during the current weekend and mid-week meetings. We have regular evening meetings when parking is not in force on weekends for our sake, and it is difficult to know how we would cope without this.

We have a lesser need for parking during the week for those attending various mid-week meetings, but these are generally in the evening when parking is not in force on different times during the day. At the moment, the parking restrictions in Brook Drive apply to all buildings work next to the Tabernacle have been relaxed.

In addition, we run a large Sunday school in the morning with a great deal of early to rising children. There are hundreds of children attending the Sunday School which we collect with buses from the estates in the area. Rochingam, Highbury, Chadwell, China Walk etc. These buses also need to be parked on the streets adjacent to these estates from the estates in the area. Rochingam, Highbury, Chadwell, China Walk etc.

The Metropolitan Tabernacle is attended by many families and many of these stay all day and bring food with them in their vehicles. We have an arrangement with the University of the Arts, London, whereby we use parking next to St George’s Road in a car park which is no means enough to provide

On Sundays, we have responsibility for transporting the parking of the cars driven by those who attend the church. Although some of our congregation travel by public transport there are also those who drive their own, especially those from estates in the area. We already accommodate a considerable number of parking bays and any of these extra, we feel we have more than enough.

We have a lesser need for parking during the week for those attending various mid-week meetings, but these are generally in the evening when parking is not in force on weekends for our sake, and it is difficult to know how we would cope without this.

We have a lesser need for parking during the week for those attending various mid-week meetings, but these are generally in the evening when parking is not in force on weekends for our sake, and it is difficult to know how we would cope without this.

ELEPHANT AND CASTLE

I do not live in the Controller Parking Zone under review but I frequently park near the church which I attend, the Metropolitan Tabernacle. It is for this reason that I have responded to the survey.

On Sundays, I have responsibility for organizing the parking of the cars driven by those who attend the church. Although some of our congregation travel by public transport there are also those who drive their own, especially those from estates in the area. We already accommodate a considerable number of parking bays and any of these extra, we feel we have more than enough.

We have a lesser need for parking during the week for those attending various mid-week meetings, but these are generally in the evening when parking is not in force on weekends for our sake, and it is difficult to know how we would cope without this.

We have a lesser need for parking during the week for those attending various mid-week meetings, but these are generally in the evening when parking is not in force on weekends for our sake, and it is difficult to know how we would cope without this.
ELEPHANT AND CASTLE

I am writing on behalf of the Sunday School that operates at the Metropolitan Tabernacle Baptist Church. For over 40 years we have been transporting children into the church on a Sunday afternoon, making use of a fleet of minibuses and private cars. These vehicles are primarily parked on the Tabernacle premises but some are also parked on the local streets. Currently over 300 children are brought in and taken home each week using 13 minibuses and 8 cars as well as walking routes.

The Sunday School is staffed by over 100 members of the Church, many of whom drive as this is the only practical way of travelling in and out of the area on Sundays. We have tried hard not to inconvenience local residents by renting space in the shopping centre car park and negotiating space with the next door college, however some local street parking is still required to operate the Sunday school work.

The Sunday School has influenced thousands of children and young people in our area over the past decades providing spiritual and moral instruction to a whole generation. The Sunday meetings are supplemented by midweek games meetings providing a focus for many teenagers and aiming to keep them away from undesirable and antisocial activities.

To maintain this vital Sunday and midweek ministry to the local area we would request that the C2 CPZ is not extended to the weekends or evenings.

Yours sincerely

- Tabernacle Sunday School

ELLIOTTS ROW

There are too many disabled parking bays in Elliotts Row reduce them also parking pay meter would help visitors to park in Elliotts Row when visiting friends.

For certain people with mobility impairments the double yellow lines on the left hand side next to the small park is causing problems. The lines are putting people with disabilities at risk as they are being disregarded.

There cannot be parking on both sides of Elliotts Row so it was provided access for emergency vehicles on several occasions in the past year. The junction of Elliotts Row and St George's road is narrow and cars parked on both sides makes turning difficult into Elliotts Row if you are waiting on the traffic light to get to conclude. There is no notice on the single yellow line opposite the two disabled parking bays for people turning to park.

To maintain the visual and midweek ministry to the local area we would request that the C2 CPZ is not extended to the weekends or evenings.
ELLIOTTS ROW

Current times work well. Any extension would make it very difficult to have visitors as there are very few parking options in the area. Current times also mean those of us who do not have cars are more able to hire cars for the odd evening / weekend (if we had no place to park them it would make hiring a car more difficult). I've not seen any problem in terms of parking space at evenings and weekends - when I have had visitors there has always been a space or two in Elliott's row or Hayles St, so I can't see there is real demand for any change to the current times.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.

In my part of the zone there are at least two cycle parks nearby and at least one car club bay, which seems sufficient.
Street Name

GLADSTONE STREET

I find that the street have been getting busier and with the elephant and castle development and other developments I expect this will increase. The busiest day is Saturday when you cannot park on our street in the morning.

Many thanks

GLADSTONE STREET

Than you for conducting this consultation. In my experience there has been a big increase over the last 5-10 years in weekend parking by non-residents in the part of the C2 area I know best (around Gladstone Street). This is particularly on Saturday mornings, when the amount of non-resident parking is considerable - and very noisy and disruptive. My preference would be for the C2 zone to operate on Saturday & Sunday mornings. Alternatively, extending the zone to operate at least on Saturday mornings would be a very welcome change.

GLASSHILL STREET

Very happy with parking arrangements at the moment. It does not get overly congested on weekends, allows for friends/family to visit and provides a good and rare opportunity to park and then take public transport into central London.

GRAY STREET

I think the time should be from 8:30 in the morning until 8:30 in the evening and this should apply at weekends as well.

GRAY STREET

Existing bays have been lost to the installation of cycle hoops/hangers. In conjunction with the introduction of cycle lanes which create challenging access conditions into the street together with the School Run and Saturday music lessons in neighbouring schools makes parking on a weekend a significant challenge. Week time controls are sufficient as existing, however any change to neighbouring areas should be considered in conjunction with the impact on surrounding areas. Ultimately, recommendations should be proposed to residents for approval, not rubber stamped without appropriate consultation.

There is currently an illegally installed cycle hoop on Gladstone Street which was put up without resident consultation. This consultation without resident consultation ignores the Conservation Area status of the street and is contrary in illegality. It is important that the introduction of cycle lanes which create challenging access conditions into the street are subject to appropriate consultation and not simply installed without appropriate consultation.

GRAY STREET

I think we might like to have a cycle bay at some time but the moment it is not being discussed.

GRAY STREET

I think the number of parking spaces should be retained and maybe even increased along Gray Street as this prevents traffic traveling too fast along Gray Street when the road is having deliveries.

Comment

GRAY STREET

The number of parking spaces should be retained and maybe even increased along Gray Street as this prevents traffic traveling too fast along Gray Street.

GRAY STREET

Re bicycles - we have many cyclists in our street and seem now to have some cycle sheds - one in the Wrong place - but do not know how they work.

GRAY STREET

There are several improvements which could be made to Gray Street, including:

1. The introduction of cycle lanes which create challenging access conditions into the street together with the School Run and Saturday music lessons in neighbouring schools makes parking on a weekend a significant challenge.
2. Week time controls are sufficient as existing, however any change to neighbouring areas should be considered in conjunction with the impact on surrounding areas. Ultimately, recommendations should be proposed to residents for approval, not rubber stamped without appropriate consultation.
3. There is currently an illegally installed cycle hoop on Gladstone Street which was put up without resident consultation. In conjunction with the introduction of cycle lanes which create challenging access conditions into the street are subject to appropriate consultation and not simply installed without appropriate consultation.

GRAY STREET

I think the number of parking spaces should be retained and maybe even increased along Gray Street when the road is having deliveries.
Great Suffolk Street

In respect to Q2, I suggest Mon-Fri 9:30am to 6:00pm.

Also, there is a parking space for loading (1hr no return) which was created last year on Webber St (by Great Suffolk St junction) which replaced car parking spaces with usual C2 timings. HOWEVER, this new loading spot is not being used by the 'Co-operative' store for which it was created. The lorries for the 'co-operative' park in front of their store on Southwark Bridge Rd. THEREFORE, the loading bay is ineffective and I suggest it can be returned to a parking spot without loading restrictions.

The narrowing of Great Suffolk Street, by the bike hire spot, has resulted in my car being damaged by passing traffic because there is not enough space for two way traffic. I suggest that you consider making part of this road one way or investigate whether there is adequate space for two way traffic on this stretch.

The imposition of road signs and control for two way traffic could be another alternative.

GREAT SUFFOLK STREET

Is it possible to get free parking for workers from my housing association doing repairs? They can never find a place to park and they tend to be distracted from the job at hand always thinking "Have I got a ticket for my van?". Once upon a time when social housing was run by the council I'm sure they would be able to give their council workers a place to park in the street for doing repairs. Why not make it so workers can park in the street for doing repairs for a few months? That would help the community and it is more efficient for the workers. If I return after 18:30 I can park on a single line.

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park in a single line after 18:30.

If there is an issue with parking on Great Suffolk Street, I can still park close to my property rather than having to find a C2 parking bay.

There is a problem with the suspension of bays for building work means it is often very difficult to find a parking space. Many residents should be consulted at least notified.

Outside of the street:

The suspension of bays to allow building work means it is often very difficult to find a parking space. Many residents should be consulted at least notified.

Great Suffolk Street

Residents spaces, do not reduce them please.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.
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There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.
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There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

There are always issues with parking on Great Suffolk Street but at least I know I can park on a single line after 18:30.
I believe extending the parking hours in the evenings and weekends so there is no reason for imposing evening and/or weekend charges on Great Suffolk Street is not possible. The traffic is there all the time but for lower pedestrian levels.

On Sundays driving a car is a real problem for my road as near the shops is not possible. The problem is a real problem during the weekends and others take the weekend run at the shops.

As a resident who does not own a car and rely on friends and family to visit me using their cars on evenings and weekends, I am completely against any form of evening and weekend charges. There is no shortage of space in the evenings and weekends so there is no reason for imposing evening and/or weekend charges on Harmsworth Mews.

On a Saturday, when does your car and family not have friends and family visiting you in your home? On evenings and weekends, I am completely against any form of evening and weekend charges on Harmsworth Mews.

I am currently a tenant of a flat which is a block of private apartments, and the parking in the basement is very limited and the prices for a parking spot are very expensive in excess of £50,000.00.

On current rates, this will cause more cars to park on the nearby streets outside of the current parking hours which are 07:30 - 18:30.

Great Suffolk Street

I have resided on Hayles Street for the last 17 years, since this time on the weekends parking has been a nightmare.

Another example is a street during the weekends it’s a car park on the road close to the park, it makes the run very tight and difficult.

With traffic parked on both sides of the street, there have been a number of incidents in that street, people getting stuck with no space to manoeuvre.

Certain streets are becoming problematic when you have a car and need to access the theatre in opposite directions. For example, the weekend is a problem in Hayles Street which with vehicles parked on both sides of the street, there are no spaces for parking.

Great Suffolk Street

neighbouring residents works.

The answer that I don’t think parking bays should be replaced with on street cycle parking is because on my street and the surrounding streets, there seem sufficient spaces for bikes. There might be other areas of C2 where there is more need which I am not aware of.

The opposite my current job you have the space which is in works is in progress, this will add another substantial amount of car users onto the current residents parks.

Great Suffolk Street

I don’t think parking bays should be replaced with on street cycle parking as it will be next to impossible to park our cars which we pay £125 a year to do.

Currently my current job you have the space which is in working which is not the whole C2 zone would be beneficial to all in the long run as once these two things happen.

Great Suffolk Street

Currently the operation hours of the C2 around the neighbouring area and not the whole C2 zone would be beneficial to all in the long run as once these two things happen.
HAYLES STREET

In the south of C2 parking is now very difficult during periods where no restrictions are in place. This has been exacerbated by:

1. Increase in properties in the area.
2. The new leisure centre very close by.

Close to buses and tube/train to the centre people park and then take public transport at weekends and evenings. Already very busy as:

2. The new leisure centre very close by.
3. Increase in properties in the area.

Best regards

My suggestion would be to have some bays with more restrictions then others i.e half as existing rules and half with new weekend restrictions.

Car club access would be good. We are in Zip Car and the one car on our street is never available. The nearest spots are some walk away. I think we have more car club access if the street was allocated as some small street tree.

Best regards
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HAYLES STREET

There are too many cars on Hayles street. It has a narrow and effectively one-way street. I would like to see the number of parking bays reduced significantly. We have excellent public transport in this area, and for most people cars are not necessary.

HAYLES STREET

Our main problem isSprinklings behaviour. The workshops tend to come by car rather than using public transport.

Not sure how many permits a household can buy, but some families certainly have a lot of cars. Are people in the zone using permits for family offices, the zone is a commercial base.

We have a number of cars in one street display C parking permits AND council parking permits. However, one car parking permit AND council parking permits. Are the residents or household running the business? How many cars do they have? Is there also the question of the space in between numbers 5 and 7 on Hayles Street. As I understand, this is part of the public highway. However, the residents of Hayles Street are using a private parking lot. Is this legal?

There is also the question of the space in between numbers 5 and 7 on Hayles Street. The area is a commercial office, with 2006 review. And there is also inadequate provision for disabled parking. We lost a disabled bay on Hayles Street and I know from personal experience this has been detrimental to disabled visitors to the street. One visitor in particular, a wheelchair user, is forced to park at the top end of Hayles Street (near Brook Drive) and travel the length of the street to his destination at the bottom end. This is not really acceptable - there should be at least two or three widely spaced out bays for the disabled on the street.

The inclusion of a car club bay would be invaluable – with the increase in residents in the area recently and the near future, it would be sensible to provide for those residents who want or need only irregular access to a car or van.

There is also inadequate provision for disabled parking. We lost a disabled bay on Hayles Street and I know from personal experience this has been detrimental to disabled visitors to the street. One visitor in particular, a wheelchair user, is forced to park at the top end of Hayles Street (near Brook Drive) and travel the length of the street to his destination at the bottom end. This is not really acceptable – there should be at least two or three widely spaced out bays for the disabled on the street.

The induction of a car club bay would be invaluable – with the increase in residents in the area recently and the near future, and the fact that parking is already at a premium, it would be sensible to provide for those residents who want or need only infrequent access to a car or van.

The induction of a car club bay would be invaluable – with the increase in residents in the area recently and the near future, and the fact that parking is already at a premium, it would be sensible to provide for those residents who want or need only infrequent access to a car or van.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

(|) set weight restriction for the road (if not suitable for lorries)
(|) install a bollard outside 7 Hayles Street (similar to that already in place outside No 40) to prevent vehicles from mounting the pavement
(|) display any parking on the double yellow lines outside 7-13 Hayles Street

Please could you change the traffic controls to solve this problem. I have these suggestions:

dangerous. The proposed restrictions are doing those houses no good.

HAYLES STREET

There is a problem at the northern end of Hayles Street, which is narrow. In particular, there are double yellow lines on both sides of the street from the junction with St George's Road to 13. These double yellow lines are currently used by double yellow lines on both sides of the street from the junction with St George's Road to 13.

HAYLES STREET

Sundays are a nightmare for parking because of the Tabernacle minibus.
Street Name

RAYLES STREET
No Comments for this question, as I do not have a car but I do have visitors.

ISAAC WAY
Current restrictions seem adequate. I am not convinced that the cost of enforcement outside existing times would be worthwhile.

ISAAC WAY
Would be good to extend the parking restriction to 8pm during the week.

KING EDWARD WALK
I have consulted all car owners of King Edward Walk.

KING EDWARD WALK
We are content with the weekday parking restrictions but we would like to extend this C2 Residents Parking Bay to 8pm - 2pm on Sundays in line with Lambeth's restrictions for adjoining streets. This is under review to continue.

KING EDWARD WALK
King Edward Walk is used to park cars on the southern side of the street. Over the years we have had a lot of problems with cars parking.

KING EDWARD WALK
I have considered all car owners of King Edward Walk.

KING JAMES STREET
Current arrangements work well and do not need changing.

KINGS BENCH STREET
We have controlled parking on Kings Bench Street and we are happy with the times and parking bays. However, I have seen very poor parking with many spaces.

LANCASTER ROAD
We are concerned with the weekend parking restrictions that would like to extend this C2 Residents Parking Bay to 8pm - 2pm on Sundays.

LANCASTER ROAD
Living in the north of the region - the area is busy at weekends (like C1) we feel parking on the weekends to 8pm is crucial. Given proximity to the nearby hospital.

LANCASTER STREET
Parking bays are not enough and restrictions are increasing with new restrictions being put in place.

LANCASTER STREET
No comments for this question so I do not have a car but do have visitors.

LANT STREET
I think car clubs should be encouraged to give residents alternatives to owning a car. I would like to see investment in providing charging points for electric cars, so as to encourage their use.

LANCASTER STREET
Increasing restrictions will most strongly disadvantage the less well off in the borough.

LANCASTER STREET
I am therefore strongly opposed to (i) either reducing the space or (ii) increasing the restricted hours.

LANCASTER STREET
In my opinion the current system is far allowing friends and visitors from outside London to be able to visit in an affordable manner - particularly elderly relatives.

LANCASTER STREET
The key benefits of the current system are for allowing friends and visitors from outside London to be able to visit in an affordable manner - particular elderly relatives.

LANCASTER STREET
To encourage this use.

LANCASTER STREET
Southbank restrictions on Saturday to Monday will help alleviate this.

LAMBETH ROAD
Residents and businesses need to use the days from time to time.

KINGSBENCH STREET
Millennium City Garages on Kings Bench Street constantly have cars parked in the bays in Kings Bench Street without tickets or permits. This often prevents those local residents and businesses from using the space.

KINGSBENCH STREET
We have controlled parking on Kings Bench Street and we are happy with the times and parking bays. However, I have seen very poor parking with many spaces.

KINGSBENCH STREET
We are concerned with the weekend parking restrictions that would like to extend this C2 Residents Parking Bay to 8pm - 2pm on Sundays.

KINGSBENCH STREET
We are content with the weekend parking restrictions that would like to extend this C2 Residents Parking Bay to 8pm - 2pm on Sundays.

LANCASTER STREET
The key benefits of the current system are for allowing friends and visitors from outside London to be able to visit in an affordable manner - particularly elderly relatives.

LANCASTER STREET
To encourage their use.

LANCASTER STREET
Southbank restrictions on Saturday to Monday will help alleviate this.

LAMBETH ROAD
Residents and businesses need to use the days from time to time.

KINGSBENCH STREET
Millennium City Garages on Kings Bench Street constantly have cars parked in the bays in Kings Bench Street without tickets or permits. This often prevents those local residents and businesses from using the space.

KINGSBENCH STREET
We have controlled parking on Kings Bench Street and we are happy with the times and parking bays. However, I have seen very poor parking with many spaces.

KINGSBENCH STREET
We are concerned with the weekend parking restrictions that would like to extend this C2 Residents Parking Bay to 8pm - 2pm on Sundays.

KINGSBENCH STREET
We are content with the weekend parking restrictions that would like to extend this C2 Residents Parking Bay to 8pm - 2pm on Sundays.

LANCASTER STREET
The key benefits of the current system are for allowing friends and visitors from outside London to be able to visit in an affordable manner - particularly elderly relatives.

LANCASTER STREET
To encourage their use.

LANCASTER STREET
Southbank restrictions on Saturday to Monday will help alleviate this.

LAMBETH ROAD
Residents and businesses need to use the days from time to time.

KINGSBENCH STREET
Millennium City Garages on Kings Bench Street constantly have cars parked in the bays in Kings Bench Street without tickets or permits. This often prevents those local residents and businesses from using the space.

KINGSBENCH STREET
We have controlled parking on Kings Bench Street and we are happy with the times and parking bays. However, I have seen very poor parking with many spaces.

KINGSBENCH STREET
We are concerned with the weekend parking restrictions that would like to extend this C2 Residents Parking Bay to 8pm - 2pm on Sundays.

KINGSBENCH STREET
We are content with the weekend parking restrictions that would like to extend this C2 Residents Parking Bay to 8pm - 2pm on Sundays.

LANCASTER STREET
The key benefits of the current system are for allowing friends and visitors from outside London to be able to visit in an affordable manner - particularly elderly relatives.

LANCASTER STREET
To encourage their use.

LANCASTER STREET
Southbank restrictions on Saturday to Monday will help alleviate this.

LAMBETH ROAD
Residents and businesses need to use the days from time to time.

KINGSBENCH STREET
Millennium City Garages on Kings Bench Street constantly have cars parked in the bays in Kings Bench Street without tickets or permits. This often prevents those local residents and businesses from using the space.

KINGSBENCH STREET
We have controlled parking on Kings Bench Street and we are happy with the times and parking bays. However, I have seen very poor parking with many spaces.

KINGSBENCH STREET
We are concerned with the weekend parking restrictions that would like to extend this C2 Residents Parking Bay to 8pm - 2pm on Sundays.

KINGSBENCH STREET
We are content with the weekend parking restrictions that would like to extend this C2 Residents Parking Bay to 8pm - 2pm on Sundays.

LANCASTER STREET
The key benefits of the current system are for allowing friends and visitors from outside London to be able to visit in an affordable manner - particularly elderly relatives.

LANCASTER STREET
To encourage their use.

LANCASTER STREET
Southbank restrictions on Saturday to Monday will help alleviate this.

LAMBETH ROAD
Residents and businesses need to use the days from time to time.

KINGSBENCH STREET
Millennium City Garages on Kings Bench Street constantly have cars parked in the bays in Kings Bench Street without tickets or permits. This often prevents those local residents and businesses from using the space.

KINGSBENCH STREET
We have controlled parking on Kings Bench Street and we are happy with the times and parking bays. However, I have seen very poor parking with many spaces.

KINGSBENCH STREET
We are concerned with the weekend parking restrictions that would like to extend this C2 Residents Parking Bay to 8pm - 2pm on Sundays.

KINGSBENCH STREET
We are content with the weekend parking restrictions that would like to extend this C2 Residents Parking Bay to 8pm - 2pm on Sundays.

LANCASTER STREET
The key benefits of the current system are for allowing friends and visitors from outside London to be able to visit in an affordable manner - particularly elderly relatives.

LANCASTER STREET
To encourage their use.

LANCASTER STREET
Southbank restrictions on Saturday to Monday will help alleviate this.

LAMBETH ROAD
Residents and businesses need to use the days from time to time.

KINGSBENCH STREET
Millennium City Garages on Kings Bench Street constantly have cars parked in the bays in Kings Bench Street without tickets or permits. This often prevents those local residents and businesses from using the space.

KINGSBENCH STREET
We have controlled parking on Kings Bench Street and we are happy with the times and parking bays. However, I have seen very poor parking with many spaces.

KINGSBENCH STREET
We are concerned with the weekend parking restrictions that would like to extend this C2 Residents Parking Bay to 8pm - 2pm on Sundays.

KINGSBENCH STREET
We are content with the weekend parking restrictions that would like to extend this C2 Residents Parking Bay to 8pm - 2pm on Sundays.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LANT STREET</td>
<td>I am a car owner and have had a resident’s parking permit since 2007. I am experiencing problems parking and the situation has worsened. There have been lost resident’s parking bays and no new ones have been replaced. Recent years residents’ parking bays have disappeared on Lant Street. The CPZ operates Monday to Friday from 8.30am–6.30pm. The CPZ needs to operate seven days a week and resident bays need to be reinstated or replaced. The CPZ is popular with visitors often making it impossible to park at weekends. The CPZ operates Monday to Friday from 8.30am–6.30pm but the area is seldom clear.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

[57x529]Street Name
[169x529]Comment
LANT STREET
I am a car owner and have had a resident’s parking permit since 2007. I am experiencing problems parking and the situation has worsened. There have been lost resident’s parking bays and no new ones have been replaced. Recent years residents’ parking bays have disappeared on Lant Street. The CPZ operates Monday to Friday from 8.30am–6.30pm. The CPZ needs to operate seven days a week and resident bays need to be reinstated or replaced. The CPZ is popular with visitors often making it impossible to park at weekends. The CPZ operates Monday to Friday from 8.30am–6.30pm but the area is seldom clear.

---

89
Please do not remove any parking bays but if possible give extra bays to help small traders.

We are a small business in the area and our suppliers find it difficult to deliver goods and customers find it difficult to collect large picture frames from us at the moment, so self help parking may well help.

LANT STREET

Comment

Borough high street end of lant street. The car club (zip car) already took 2-3 spaces that could have been used for residents parking about 5-6 years ago. Residents really needed these spaces and residents can actually use them. By 6:30 I am not yet home and so they are often taken by non residents. If residents had a little help they would not have problems.

I am a woman and do not really want to park down a dark street half a mile from my home. I do not feel safe. I play badminton and come home at 10pm on one evening and end up having to park a long way away down a dark street, this is not very nice and I feel risk myself. I am almost at the point of wondering why I have a car and pay for the permit.

useable parking space to move my car back into a space by the time the normal restrictions start. It is quite difficult.

Please give residents more spaces and restrict them so residents can actually use them. I am not a lorry
driver. This is a local contradiction to the weekend rules:

I asked if we could have more residents bays and I was told no because lorries need to be able to turn around - however this is a total contradiction to the weekend rules:

We are a small business in the area and our suppliers find it difficult to deliver goods and customers find it difficult to collect large picture frames from us at the moment, so self help parking may well help.

LONDON ROAD

We are a small business in the area and our suppliers find it difficult to deliver goods and customers find it difficult to collect large picture frames from us at the moment, so self help parking may well help.

Please do not remove any parking bays but if possible give extra bays to help small traders.

I am a woman and do not really want to park down a dark street half a mile from my home. I do not feel safe. I play badminton and come home at 10pm on one evening and end up having to park a long way away down a dark street, this is not very nice and I feel risk myself. I am almost at the point of wondering why I have a car and pay for the permit.

I asked if we could have more residents bays and I was told no because lorries need to be able to turn around - however this is a total contradiction to the weekend rules:

We are a small business in the area and our suppliers find it difficult to deliver goods and customers find it difficult to collect large picture frames from us at the moment, so self help parking may well help.
LONDON ROAD

I have ticked for NO CHANGE but I think the times for the weekdays should be reduced to 9am to 6pm to reflect people leaving for work after 8.30am and before 9am and returning after the Congestion Charge ends at 6pm.

I believe Southwark are 'Consulting' in order to increase your revenue by adding evenings and weekends. You receive enough revenue from the residents at the moment and the proposed increase would restrict essential or personal evening or weekend visiting from people outside of Southwark such as health workers for the young, elderly or sick plus any family relatives that keeps social cohesion that which your proposal would dis-encourage.

Parking should be FREE for those paying Council Tax and have seen no extra reward from this extra tax you levy for parking. Parking should be FREE for all residents of the ward.

MARSHALSEA ROAD

There are more spaces that are allocated to residents for car club or spaces that have just been reduced for no reason at all. This leads to sometimes having to drive around for 30 minutes before being able to find a parking.

ORIENT STREET

There are insufficient residents bays in West Square and Austral Street. These should be increased.

MILCOTE STREET

5 minutes before being able to drive around for 30 minutes before being able to find a parking.

DO NOT INCREASE THE TIMES AND OR DAYS.
OSWIN STREET

I would like Oswin St to be residents parking all weekend as I very rarely use my car at the weekend as I can never get parked when I return home.

Sunday is very bad due to the Tabernacle Church users at certain times of the day, I pay my money to enable me to park my car. They also park on double yellow lines, which I didn’t think was allowed, also people use the area when they use the new leisure centre.

I’m sorry to be pressing a special case but it is necessary to do so.

There are cars parked all along Oswin Street and Rock Drive, blocking entry into my garage at 1 Oswin Street. It is highly frustrating. It would be greatly appreciated if something could be done about this.

There are an increased number of mini cabs parking on the street. This has made the street more noisy and crowded. I would like to see that this is avoided.

Every morning, commuters and the YouTube of the Youtube are sources taking place of the Metropolitan District across from the E&C shopping centre.

Every time I go down to the ferry I get worked up.

In the last 20 years, the traffic just got worse.

Numbers of delivery services are now able to park on street.

Cars use the free parking ticket due to the lack of space, is it a free service to live in Oswin Street and London?

Cyclists need the road to be clear.

There have been safety concerns.

Some motorists use the building (CC) opposite our house as a toilet. There are hidden corners in the dark.

Go to the office and ask for a list of premises in the area.

I would like to propose to make the residents 24 hours basis Oswin Street located close to the Elephant & Castle tube station, zone 1.

Motorists from outside of London use Oswin Street to park their cars and jump on a bus or tube. Recently I have noticed a presence of mini cabs (with Uber system) waiting for the orders/clients.

There is a solution. Make Oswin Street (perhaps alone or perhaps also Hayles St and Elliott’s Row) permanently NO PARKING EXCEPT IF RESIDENT OR VISITING (– premises in the streets concerned).

Note also that CSH7 runs through these previously quiet residential streets. Oswin St being much used as an alternative sub-route by cyclists. Dealing with the present problem of parking would benefit them and increase safety.

There is a solution. Make Oswin St (perhaps alone or premises in Elliott St and Hayles St) a NO PARKING EXCEPT IF RESIDENT OR VISITING (– premises in the streets concerned).

Every Monday afternoon and the whole of Sunday, there are services taking place of the Metropolitan District across from the E&C shopping centre.

Every morning, commuters and the YouTube of the Youtube are sources taking place of the Metropolitan District across from the E&C shopping centre.

Every Monday afternoon and the whole of Sunday, there are services taking place of the Metropolitan District across from the E&C shopping centre.

Every morning, commuters and the YouTube of the Youtube are sources taking place of the Metropolitan District across from the E&C shopping centre.

20 years the traffic just got worse.

Every morning, commuters and the YouTube of the Youtube are sources taking place of the Metropolitan District across from the E&C shopping centre.

Every morning, commuters and the YouTube of the Youtube are sources taking place of the Metropolitan District across from the E&C shopping centre.

Every morning, commuters and the YouTube of the Youtube are sources taking place of the Metropolitan District across from the E&C shopping centre.

Every morning, commuters and the YouTube of the Youtube are sources taking place of the Metropolitan District across from the E&C shopping centre.

Every morning, commuters and the YouTube of the Youtube are sources taking place of the Metropolitan District across from the E&C shopping centre.

Every morning, commuters and the YouTube of the Youtube are sources taking place of the Metropolitan District across from the E&C shopping centre.

Every morning, commuters and the YouTube of the Youtube are sources taking place of the Metropolitan District across from the E&C shopping centre.
OSWIN STREET

Parking in the C2 zone, Oswin Street SE11 4TF, has become a service road to these buildings: cars and vans parking at any time to deliver to No.1 Elephant and Castle Leisure Centre, Mace building, Longville Rd. There appears to be an increasing number of Uber taxi cars parked in resident parking bays with drivers in them and engines running, it is said that these drivers are working for Uber. It is not clear how this problem can be resolved.

OSWIN STREET

Parking times should be from 7 am to 7 pm seven days a week. Oswin Street needs to be made into a one-way street, as it is already becoming a service road for the new apartments that have been built on No.1 Elephant, the Castle Leisure Centre, the Mace building, Longville Rd. There are two parking spaces that could be made available at the top end of Oswin Street.

In Oswin Street there is a disabled parking bay that was correctly introduced outside of the house of a disabled person. That resident died several years ago and the bay is still in place. If this restriction were removed, another bay might be made available. In the future another bay might be required for another disabled person. That could be placed outside their house.

OSWIN STREET

A one-way street would help to slow the traffic speed down. At the top end of Oswin Street, two more parking spaces could be made. Oswin Street needs longer hours for parking. 7 am to 7 pm seven days a week. Thank you.

OSWIN STREET

There has been an increase in cars parked in resident parking bays with drivers in them and engines running. It is said that these drivers are working for Uber. It is not clear how this problem can be resolved.

OSWIN STREET

Parking in the (C2) zone, Oswin Street SE11 4TF, has become a service road to these buildings: cars and vans parking at any time to deliver to No.1 Elephant and Castle Leisure Centre, Mace building, Longville Rd. There appears to be an increasing number of Uber taxi cars parked in resident parking bays with drivers in them and engines running, it is said that these drivers are working for Uber. It is not clear how this problem can be resolved.
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OSWIN STREET

Parking in the (C2) zone, Oswin Street SE11 4TF, has become a service road to these buildings: cars and vans parking at any time to deliver to No.1 Elephant and Castle Leisure Centre, Mace building, Longville Rd. There appears to be an increasing number of Uber taxi cars parked in resident parking bays with drivers in them and engines running, it is said that these drivers are working for Uber. It is not clear how this problem can be resolved.
POCOCK STREET
An extension to the operating hours of residents only parking restrictions would not be equitable to large numbers of new building owners (often young families) who are not entitled to residents parking permits.

Increasing numbers of properties are being built which are not entitled to residents parking permits. On my street (Pocock Street) it is likely that the majority of residents are excluded from permits.

This is a method to ensure that new building projects are acceptable to existing residents, which I accept. However, an extension of the hours where parking restrictions operate would place an unequitable burden on these residents. Free evening and weekend parking is essential to enable social calls, shopping and deliveries. There is no intermediate option for low-cost parking; if the residents parking area is in operation then the alternative is extremely high cost pay-to-park.

I would urge the council to consider the livelihoods and wellbeing of all residents, and not just those lucky enough to be entitled to residents parking permits. I would also urge the council to consider the advantages and wellbeing of all residents, not just those lucky enough to be entitled to residents parking permits. I would also

POCOCK STREET
We feel that there are too many vehicles parked in the area all the time, which is causing disturbance and social disruption. On the street through the week they have a

POCOCK STREET
And these are the times we do large shopping and we will have to drive close to our doors to offload the items.

POCOCK STREET
The majority of residents in the area are new and improving the

POCOCK STREET
As a general point I would like to see the parking spaces re-proposed for cycle parking / pocket parks. The majority of residents in the area are new and improving the

POCOCK STREET
Changing the parking times will only make life harder. Therefore, leave it as it is please.

POCOCK STREET
Zone is really pretty and really quiet. I am at the top of c and I do not see any services readily available in c, I get food delivered etc. in c and cannot park.
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POCOCK STREET
Changing the parking times will only make life harder. Therefore, leave it as it is please.

POCOCK STREET
Zone is really pretty and really quiet. I am at the top of c and I do not see any services readily available in c, I get food delivered etc. in c and cannot park.

POCOCK STREET
Increasing numbers of properties are being built which are not entitled to residents parking permits. On my street (Pocock Street) it is likely that the majority of residents are excluded from permits.
POCOCK STREET

Being a resident in a newly built development, I am not entitled to a resident parking permit, the current operating hours are already causing huge inconvenience for myself and my family. Increasing operating times will seriously hamper our lifestyle and deprive us and other residents from normal daily necessities such as going to work and coming back home.

I appreciate the fact that you will take our views into account on this matter.

POCOCK STREET

Our area is congested with unnecessary motor traffic. I would support increased enforcement of car parking spaces and greening of spaces, in particular on Pocock Street, which is far wider than it needs to be for its western end.

I would favour increased provision of car parking spaces and greening of space, in particular on Pocock Street, which is far wider than it needs to be for its western end.

Thanks

POCOCK STREET
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRINCESS STREET</td>
<td>Princess Street could do with a Loading Bay in addition to the disabled parking bays (or possibly instead of one of the disabled bays). Often delivery lorries - eg Supermarkets - are blocking the road (which is part of the Northern Cycle bypass for Elephant &amp; Castle) and causing risk to cyclists, pedestrians and issues for other motorists. While I appreciate that it may be intended to have the disabled bays to help serve the Doctors practice, it's not clear that this is the use the bays are put to (and indeed it's not obvious how the people who park frequently in the bays have managed to justify their blue badge). I understand that one of the consultation’s issues is traffic around the new Castle centre. It’s clear there’s an issue around the Brook Drive/Pastor Street junction with significant parking of minibuses from the Metropolitan Tabernacle. Not only are these parked on the single yellow lines, but there are often many parked on the double yellow line area - but the enforcement is weak on Sundays. The operation/timing/enforcement around this area needs to be reviewed to prevent the risk to pedestrians and other road users from the significant levels of parking here. On Lant Street (south), there is scope for additional parking bays in what is currently a single-lane area opposite the Rise apartment building north of the Sanctuary Street junction. The changes in the road due to the developments at Charles Dickens School mean parking provision here should be reviewed. Another issue is that many residents only have cars to access the doctors and surgery on Rushworth Street. The change in the road leading to the developments at Charles Dickens School and parking provision here should be reviewed. In addition, the change in the road leading to the developments at Charles Dickens School and parking provision here should be reviewed. In Redcross Way, there is scope for additional parking bays in what is currently a single-lane area opposite the Rosemary building of the Sanctuary Street. In Redcross Way, there is scope for additional parking bays in what is currently a single-lane area opposite the Rosemary building of the Sanctuary Street. In Redcross Way, there is scope for additional parking bays in what is currently a single-lane area opposite the Rosemary building of the Sanctuary Street. In Redcross Way, there is scope for additional parking bays in what is currently a single-lane area opposite the Rosemary building of the Sanctuary Street. Redcross Way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southwark Bridge Road is a large road leading nowhere on the south bank and arguably nowhere on the north either. There is a large amount of pedestrian and cycle traffic and it is used as a shortcut by a disproportionate number of large building site lorries accessing sites in the locality. There are what appear to be a significant number of accidents and near misses at the junction between Great Suffolk Street and Southwark Bridge Road. This area has a square and a heavily used parade of shops and cafes.

Could one consider making this road one way? This would massively reduce heavy traffic. It would also increase space for pedestrians and cyclists. As the road is broad it would also give the opportunity to plant more trees along its length and give increased parking provision on the road itself ..... perhaps under the trees in a chevron configuration. This would encourage the street level viability of businesses and shops building upon what is a vibrant area.

I have lived here for 23 and I have definitely noticed how hard it is to park my car in the evening and weekends. I often have to park my vehicle a long way from my property and wait for the parking spaces to free up. In particular, the hours of operation need to be extended as parking on a weekend close to our property is near impossible despite all the efforts of the council. I have so many warning tickets, the cars that park in the permit bays are vehicles that don't seem to have owners that live in the area.

Parking is a real issue in the vicinity of our property and the availability of kerb side parking is being eaten into by car club, bike parking, electric vehicle parking (this often results in an empty bay). I see these as being important too but I think the council should look to directly new sites for these rather than taking away existing spots.

In particular the hours of operation need to be extended as parking on a weekend close to our property is near impossible despite all the efforts of the council. I have so many warning tickets, the cars that park in the permit bays are vehicles that don't seem to have owners that live in the area.

Parking is a real issue in the vicinity of our property and the availability of kerb side parking is being eaten into by car club, bike parking, electric vehicle parking (this often results in an empty bay). I see these as being important too but I think the council should look to directly new sites for these rather than taking away existing spots.

In particular the hours of operation need to be extended as parking on a weekend close to our property is near impossible despite all the efforts of the council. I have so many warning tickets, the cars that park in the permit bays are vehicles that don't seem to have owners that live in the area.

Parking is a real issue in the vicinity of our property and the availability of kerb side parking is being eaten into by car club, bike parking, electric vehicle parking (this often results in an empty bay). I see these as being important too but I think the council should look to directly new sites for these rather than taking away existing spots.

In particular the hours of operation need to be extended as parking on a weekend close to our property is near impossible despite all the efforts of the council. I have so many warning tickets, the cars that park in the permit bays are vehicles that don't seem to have owners that live in the area.

Parking is a real issue in the vicinity of our property and the availability of kerb side parking is being eaten into by car club, bike parking, electric vehicle parking (this often results in an empty bay). I see these as being important too but I think the council should look to directly new sites for these rather than taking away existing spots.

In particular the hours of operation need to be extended as parking on a weekend close to our property is near impossible despite all the efforts of the council. I have so many warning tickets, the cars that park in the permit bays are vehicles that don't seem to have owners that live in the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHWARK BRIDGE ROAD</td>
<td>I am very grateful that you are consulting residents on the C2 parking zone as I think change is long overdue. I regularly have to park my car some distance from my home, particularly since the number of residents bays around my building and the amount of single yellow line parking has been reduced in the last 12 months. In the evenings, this often leaves me having to park and walk along streets alone where as a single female I do not feel safe (poorly-lit streets where the majority of buildings are commercial and there is no one around at night). I would be very happy to demonstrate to someone involved in the consultation how vulnerable I feel parking on such streets late at night. During the evenings and weekends I generally cannot find a residents bay near to my home, as residents bays are taken by visitors when there is parking available to them; and then later move their car into a residents bay when one becomes available, so that I am legally parked for the times that parking is regulated. I have long standing problem due to the fact that my address is on boundary of C1 and 2. The nearest bays are in c1 and c2 and each year I have to go through a rigmarole to get a c1 permit. Fortunately Southwark always sort it out and I get a c1 permit. However, this change would make it mulch easier for me if it is extended to cover my address. It is fine just as is, with the exception of LONDON BRIDGE weekends and evenings parking is NOT a problem. It is fine just as is, with the exception of LONDON BRIDGE weekends and evenings parking is NOT a problem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ST GEORGES ROAD

Resident parking on St. George’s Road, on the short stretch opposite the cathedral, has become a complete nightmare at weekends when the parking zone ceases to be operational. We fully understand that visitors to the IWM need somewhere to park, and it’s great that people are visiting our local museum, but there doesn’t seem to be any consideration whatsoever for resident parking during the weekend.

It’s now got to the point that to use your vehicle on a weekend pretty much guarantees not being able to park it on your return. When you consider that most people work during the week and are therefore restricted to using their cars during the day at weekends for shopping, visiting family and friends, etc, it puts us all in such a rotten position of not being able to park anywhere near our homes on our return, even having to sometimes resort to parking on a meter and paying until spaces become free. That really is poor.

What really highlights just how poor this is, is many of my elderly neighbours now do not use their cars at weekends at all due to worries about not being able to find a parking space anywhere near their homes on their return. That is awful. I particularly know of two elderly neighbours on this stretch who now spend money on taxis to take them shopping, as they just cannot be in a position of not being able to park on their return with a car full of shopping.

On top of this, so many of us pay the council for parking allowance ticket books to allocate day parking tickets to visiting family and friends, yet the times most people visit is at weekends and there just isn’t any space for them to park, at least those of us who have bought or hold a ticket book of any sort.

I am quite happy with the current parking bay arrangements. I live near West Square, where there is the opportunity to have at least 2-3 additional resident parking bays instead of the single yellow line that currently serves no purpose.

ST GEORGES ROAD

A SPEED RESTRICTOR ON AUSTRALIA STREET AND GEORGINIA STREET WILL GREATLY ENHANCE THE SAFETY OF THE YOUNG CHILDREN AND ALSO CALM THE TRAFFIC.

THUS:

A SPEED RESTRICTOR ON THE Cycle Superhighway on the St Georges Road, there is an increased amount of traffic taking the Geraldine Road, a cut since the creation of the cycle superhighway on the St Georges Road.

ADDITIONAL RESIDENT BAY CREATE BY REPLACING THE EXISTING SINGLE YELLOW LINES THAT CURRENTLY SERVE NO PURPOSE.

I AM QUITE HAPPY WITH THE CURRENT PARKING BAY ARRANGEMENTS. I LIVE NEAR WEST SQUARE WHERE THERE IS THE OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE AT LEAST 2-3 ADDITIONAL RESIDENT BAYS CREATED BY REPLACING THE EXISTING SINGLE YELLOW LINES THAT CURRENTLY SERVE NO PURPOSE.
ST GEORGES ROAD

I think the current layout is a reasonable compromise between residents and space for deliveries, workmen etc. But there is a lot of competition for parking on Saturday mornings due to the sports facilities in Geraldine Harmsworth Park so extending the zone to Saturday mornings would give some additional protection for residents.

In Geraldine Street there should be no parking near the sharp bend. Currently there is often parking right up to the bend which is very difficult to get round, especially with a work van. Consider doing a double yellow line here.

TRUNDLE STREET

The area around Charles Dickens School has suffered a lack of parking spaces due to the works in the school that have closed partly to Tolmuin street.

Very close to that street, there are a lot of parking spaces that are empty from Monday to Friday. They are at Pocock, Sawyer and Loman Street.

It’s key for us that we can park in these streets, so I think they should be part of C2 parking zone.

There is a heavy increased local population due to new developments, new clubs and new businesses since 1999.

WEBBER ROW

Parking has become very hard in the evenings and all weekends due to the amount of new hotels in the area. If you go shopping Saturday or Sunday mornings it is almost impossible to get a parking space.

WEBBER ROW

We need many more parking bays in and around the Webber Street and Webber Row areas. There is a lot of traffic that is coming into the area, which is causing congestion.

WEBBER ROW

Parking bays could do with extending or review of what spaces could be added as some bays were removed when the road was resurfaced last year.

WEBBER ROW

WEBBER ROW

WEBBER ROW

WEBBER ROW

WEBBER ROW

Thank you

The need is increasing not decreasing for whatever reasons.

Students (inc 6th Form) plus staff/deliveries/visitors. More parking bays on Southwark Bridge Rd.

Please note the free parking at additional vehicles from Sep 2017, with the new Haberdasher's Secondary School on the other side of Mint Street on Southwark Bridge Road. 1,000

There is a heavy increased local population due to new developments, new clubs and new businesses since 1999.

TRUNDLE STREET

It can be difficult to park on the streets around Trundle during the week. It’s because parking enforcement is regular. I have seen cars/vans that either do not have a permit or have the wrong one parked here.
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WEBBER ROW

I have been asked to make these comments as Chair of the Webber and Quentin TRA and have consulted on them by email and at a public drop in session on our estate on July 9th.

The following points have been made by residents:

1. Evening C2 restrictions to be extended to 8pm on weekdays - we are impacted by Theatre and Restaurant parking.

2. Extend the C2 restrictions start time the same as Lambeth to 8am not 8.30am.

3. Levelling C2 restrictions to be extended to 6pm on weekends - we are impacted by Theatre and Restaurant parking.

4. I have been asked to make these comments as Chair of the Webber and Quentin TRA and have consulted on them by email and at a public drop in session on our estate on July 9th.

5. Installation of some motorbike road locks on Webber Street to allow illegally parked motorbikes to move out of courtyards.

6. Allow new restricted C2 zone spaces on Grey Street where C2 parking bays were previously used by removing flood in pavement area.

7. Always having to park 5-10 minutes away from my house.

8. When turning into Gray Street, sometimes into the path of oncoming traffic as two way of pedestrians crossing. I can already recorded swerving and hitting cyclists when turning into Gray Street, sometimes into the path of oncoming traffic as two way of pedestrians crossing.

9. Review taxi drop off outside Hilton Hampton Hotel on Gray Street as too close to the junction with Waterloo Road and causing cars to swerve to avoid open taxi car doors when turning into Gray Street.

10. 1 car already recorded swerving and hitting Quentin House.

11. Sundays - permit becomes necessary at 6.30pm.
WEBBER ROW

I have lived at for 26 years and have always owned a car and paid for a C2 parking permit. We have always had a shortage of C2 parking spaces but after I approached the Council several years ago an extra 8 spaces were created, which was really helpful. In the past three years, however, it has been quite a struggle to get a space due to the following:

1. Building developments (e.g. Hilton Hotel on Gray Street, Valentine Place) which have involved lots of C2 bays being suspended with no advance notice whatsoever from the Council and nothing provided as an alternative. There is a live example of this right now where for C2 spaces were suddenly suspended last week on Webber Street outside the bakery building at Valentine Place. I often have to drive across to Pocock Street to find a space for my car.

I would like to see the Council taking a more organised approach to this type of suspension and the Council action to make it easier if the results support my concerns.

2. A number of C2 permit vehicles here are people carriers as they are private taxis – these are longer than a standard car so this often reduces the amount of cars that can fit into a bay.

I would like to see the Council carry out more regular reviews of how longer vehicles impact on the availability of C2 parking spaces.

3. For a number of years several parking spaces that had parking meters outside the betting shop on Webber Street (near the junction with Blackfriars Road) became ‘free’ bays where anyone could park completely free of charge. I questioned this with the Council and asked if the spaces could be converted into C2 ones, but was told that the situation had arisen because one of the meters was faulty and motorists could claim the spaces as free parking - this seemed to me to be an absolutely ridiculous piece of legislation which created a highly unfair situation where people could park there for free when C2 permit holders were paying for their permits and struggling to find C2 bays. The Council told me that nothing could be done because it would require a review of the entire C2 area but then suddenly the bays did end up being converted into C2 ones without any major review of the entire C2 area.

I would like to see the Council take much quicker action to identify such anomalies, push for a change to this very strange legislation, and ensure fair treatment of those who pay for C2 permits.

There is also a danger spot and serious congestion on Webber Street outside the Valentine Place development due to the following:

1. After C2 bays were removed from Grey Street (previously because of the Hilton Hotel) the Council placed two C2 (for two and four car spaces) really close to the junction of Webber Street and Valentine Place. This resulted in drivers making wrong fast turns on Webber Street to get to the right place (because it was close to the C2 bay). The Council needs to carry out a proper inspection of visibility at this location and take remedial action to make it safer if the results support my concerns.

2. Ever since the Travelodge gym opened on Baron’s Place there has been a huge amount of double parking by gym members on Webber Street opposite the Valentine Place bakery building. This, coupled with the above-mentioned congestion at the junction of Valentine Place and Webber Street, has turned what was once a safe section of road into a hazard and has increased the pollution in the area from exhaust fumes. I had understood from Cllr Adele Morris that when planning was granted for the hotel, one of its undertakings was to not allow its members to create congestion from parking - but this has not been the case and the Council have not monitored or enforced this. For example, the hotel management have suspended the display of parking permits by its members, making it easy to believe that they are not parking illegally. I would like to see the Council taking more regular reviews of how longer vehicles impact on the availability of C2 parking spaces.

I would like to see the Council carry out more regular reviews of how longer vehicles impact on the availability of C2 parking spaces.

I would like the Council to please double yellow lines on Webber Street opposite the bakery building so that no one can park their cars on this stretch of road.

I would like the Council to please double yellow lines on Webber Street opposite the bakery building so that no one can park their cars on this stretch of road.

I would like the Council to please double yellow lines on Webber Street opposite the bakery building so that no one can park their cars on this stretch of road.
WEBBER STREET
The residents parking provision in Webbe
r street has been reduced since the road improvement was carrie
ed out. For those of us not entitled to residents permits becau
se the new development didn’t allow it, being able to park at weekends without a permit is essen
tial.

WEBBER STREET
I am very happy with the parking regulations at present. Please no changes.

WEBBER STREET
I think there should be more residents parking (my building is not allowed to apply for residents permits which i think is appa
lling.). I also think all new buildings should be
forced to include underground parking to ease pressure on on-street parking bays.

WEBBER STREET
I don’t see that increasing the hours will benefit residents with cars. The benefit to the council is that you will increase our parking permit costs and you are only looking to increase revenue.

WEBBER STREET
Replacing existing parking bays is a definite NO-NO. You have already put a bike shed in Silex street sacrificing a parking bay, that shed should be moved onto the pavement on the corner of webber and silex where there is ample room to place it and give residents that lost parking bay back!!!!

WEBBER STREET
With the increased building of apartments and conversion of existing buildings to residential, the council should be planning to increase availability of parking for residents not restricting or removing parking!!!!

WEBBER STREET
It is enough that car owning residents have been disadvantaged by cyclists due to the disproportionate policy driven priority given to them.

WEBBER STREET
All private cars should be discouraged as much as possible (except in extenuating circumstances e.g. disability). We have an air pollution crisis that is primarily caused by selfish people speeding along in toxic deathtraps. The less parking available, the fewer cars, the more liveable our area becomes. We have superb public transport, new, excellent cycling facilities and very walkable streets. We do not need cars. Get rid of them.

WEBBER STREET
I am very happy with the parking restrictions as they are and do not wish them to change.

WEBBER STREET
I don’t think it is necessary to have resident permits altogether. It is unreasonable for residents, we also need to be able to park our cars, living in a residential block absolutely no
one in the existing parking bays.

WEBBER STREET
I believe the area would significantly benefit from more green, tree space to combat the surrounding buildings/concrete jungle. Both in the already allocated tree areas

WEBBER STREET
I understand there has been an aspiration by the council to include more green space along this middle section of Webber Street, and indeed there are currently tree
zones which have been created as part of the roadworks. However, no tree has yet been planted (there are just weeds).

WEBBER STREET
I don’t see that increasing the hours will benefit residents with cars. The benefit to the council is that you will increase our parking permit costs and you are only looking to increase revenue.
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WEBBER STREET

I would like to respond as a non-car owner and a local resident that would like to stay in the immediate area.

We have had 3 issues in the last month where service providers / suppliers have had trouble parking on Webber St. Due to proliferation of permit parking, it is really difficult for service providers to service our building. One provider drove for about 40 minutes before finding a space (admittedly within a permit bay), the other had to leave without being able to complete the jobs we had paid for.

There is a need to provide short term parking (1 hour slots) for service vehicles (electricians, plumbers etc). Otherwise businesses will suffer and as a resident of zone 1, we won’t be able to access appropriate services.

I would be grateful if you could take this into account during your consultation.

WELLER STREET

We do not own a car but are members of Zipcar and sometimes use the digital ‘voucher’ service.

Initially I found that quite worrying to operate (i.e. I couldn’t believe that we wouldn’t get a ticket and that the car would be ‘recognised’ by the parking superintendents.) However, it seems to work!

I don’t see any reason to change that. I don’t use a big attraction like the Tate.

WEST SQUARE

There is insufficient parking space for residents - over time we have lost spaces in Geraldine Street and some in West Square itself. At weekends the current residents geting very busy.

Getting parking spaces are often filled by visitors to the Imperial War Museum.

And it is so expensive!

But I don’t see any reason to change that.

In fact, I would like to respond as a non-car owner and a local resident that would like to stay in the immediate area.
WEST SQUARE

I no longer have a car myself and I would like Southwark Council to encourage more people who live in these areas with such good public transport links, to think of the health benefits and cost benefits of NOT owning a car.

I feel that it would be easier if residents parking spaces were only for residents use only so the parking notices would say, all times.

I feel that residents parking spaces were only for residents use only so the parking notices would say, all times.

Please could additional residents parking spaces be restored in Geraldine Street. The half of Geraldine Street closest to St George's Road has been lost to cycle path.

There is a serious traffic problem in Brook Drive, which is on the Southwark/Lambeth boundary. Because of the barrier across the Sullivan Street junction with Brook Drive, coincident with the pedestrian crossing, Brook Drive effectively becomes a one-way road which is not exercised by motorists. The cycle and pedestrian facilities in Brook Drive are excellent, but the pedestrian facilities at the Sullivan Street junction are non-existent.
Thank you for allowing us to comment on the parking in C Southwark.

We do NOT find there is a problem with parking at evenings/weekends. Long visits from visitors and residents alike can park both in bay and on Yellow Lines. Extending the Controlled Parking hours would make things more difficult for residents rather than less. No changes please.

Visiting traders generally park for a whole day during the working day. As a result residents permits should work in the paid parking bays. This leaves room to do dual use, while the residents’ bays are generally full during the working day.

The access to West Square Gardens is across one end of the road and it is working that cars speed through the square.

There is nothing more frustrating than someone leaving 2 meters between them and the car in front when there is 0.5m too short a space to the rear, where I am hoping to park.

We do NOT find that there is a problem with West Square parking. We find not to be too full, while the residents’ bays are generally full during the working day.

More parking tickets should be allocated to cars that are blocking spaces by bad parking. If spaces were marked on the residents’ bays then this would be much easier to police.
Further to Qu 2: A consideration of extending the residents parking to 8:30pm Monday to Friday

Further to Qu 3: Some more trees would be welcome, although not at the expense of existing residents parking bays.

I also think we need a few more dedicated residents parking bays in my immediate area.

Sometimes there is no available parking space even though I live here.

I then need to go some distance from West Square to follow the one way system the other side of St George's Road to find somewhere to leave my car.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no provision for bikes in the West Sq micro environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am an able bodied retired person, but if this was not the case it would be a bigger inconvenience/problem.

Any new trees would be welcome, especially if they came with street calming or home zone arrangements for the Square and the connecting streets.

There is no provision for bikes in the West Sq micro environment.
I am Chair of West Square Residents Association (WSRA), which covers Austral Street, Orient Street, Austral Street & West Square. I emailed our residents to ask for their views and to encourage them to reply to you. I reported the 17 replies to our Committee, which decided that WSRA’s views are:

1) WSRA does not want any change to the hours and days that residents only parking applies to get into and around West Square.

2) More residents only parking bays should be provided as there is considerable pressure on them and the number of bays have been reduced over the years. Opportunities exist to provide more bays as follows:

- outside 17/18 and 52/53 West Square
- by converting the disabled bay outside number 11 West Square as it appears not to be used.
- by converting some of the yellow lines in Austral Street into residents only bays, in particular at the site of 24 West Square & outside 5, 7/13 on the east side and 1/3 outside 2, 4 between no. 2 & entrance to Victoria Dock
- by converting some of the pay & display bays on the west side of Austral Street as they are rarely used.
- by converting the disabled bay outside number 11 West Square as it appears not to be used.
- outside 17/18 and 52/53 West Square

3) Passing bays of double yellow lines needed in Austral Drive at regular intervals because during the weekday rush hours and weekends vehicles often cannot pass each other.

4) Much better signage is required at the entrance to Brook Drive from Kennington Road and at the entrance to Austral Street from Brook Drive in order to discourage other types of traffic from trying to enter West Square.

Other suggestions include:

- areas as part of the Green Links walk from Elephant & Castle to Gherkin Park (Southwark Link Streets)
- converting some of the yellow lines in Austral Street into residents only bays, in particular at the site of 24 West Square & outside 5, 7/13 on the east side and 1/3 outside 2, 4 between no. 2 & entrance to Victoria Dock
- by converting some of the pay & display bays on the west side of Austral Street as they are rarely used.
- by converting the disabled bay outside number 11 West Square as it appears not to be used.
- outside 17/18 and 52/53 West Square

5) Passing bays of double yellow lines needed in Brook Drive at regular intervals because during the weekday rush hours and weekends vehicles often cannot pass each other.

6) Much better signage is required at the entrance to Brook Drive from Kennington Road and at the entrance to Austral Street from Brook Drive in order to discourage other types of traffic from trying to enter West Square.

Other suggestions include:

- areas as part of the Green Links walk from Elephant & Castle to Gherkin Park (Southwark Link Streets)
- converting some of the pay & display bays on the west side of Austral Street as they are rarely used.
- by converting the disabled bay outside number 11 West Square as it appears not to be used.
- outside 17/18 and 52/53 West Square

7) Passing bays of double yellow lines needed in Brook Drive at regular intervals because during the weekday rush hours and weekends vehicles often cannot pass each other.

8) Much better signage is required at the entrance to Brook Drive from Kennington Road and at the entrance to Austral Street from Brook Drive in order to discourage other types of traffic from trying to enter West Square.

Other suggestions include:

- areas as part of the Green Links walk from Elephant & Castle to Gherkin Park (Southwark Link Streets)
- converting some of the pay & display bays on the west side of Austral Street as they are rarely used.
- by converting the disabled bay outside number 11 West Square as it appears not to be used.
- outside 17/18 and 52/53 West Square

9) Passing bays of double yellow lines needed in Brook Drive at regular intervals because during the weekday rush hours and weekends vehicles often cannot pass each other.

10) Much better signage is required at the entrance to Brook Drive from Kennington Road and at the entrance to Austral Street from Brook Drive in order to discourage other types of traffic from trying to enter West Square.

Other suggestions include:

- areas as part of the Green Links walk from Elephant & Castle to Gherkin Park (Southwark Link Streets)
- converting some of the pay & display bays on the west side of Austral Street as they are rarely used.
- by converting the disabled bay outside number 11 West Square as it appears not to be used.
- outside 17/18 and 52/53 West Square
Appendix D – Pre-consultation Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austral Street</td>
<td>28/01/2016</td>
<td>PCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Road</td>
<td>28/01/2016</td>
<td>PCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Road</td>
<td>28/01/2016</td>
<td>PCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Road</td>
<td>23/01/2016</td>
<td>PCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Road</td>
<td>28/01/2016</td>
<td>PCR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Borough Road**

- No restrictions in place. It would be ideal if times could be extended into the weekend.

- We experience a lot of difficulties in finding a parking space close to one block specifically on the weekends when there are no restrictions in place. It would be ideal if times could be extended into the weekend.

- and mass support the review being extended to cover the whole of the C2 parking zone.

**Austral Street**

- I am a Borough Road resident and we have a car. We have a C2 parking permit. My husband (the driver of this household) uses it on a regular basis. Parking along here makes it difficult to get to your destination. My recommendation would be to maintain the same level of parking for residents and locate the proposed cycle parking on a visitors bay.

**Austral Street**

- I don’t own a car so have no view whether parking is difficult however an observant it seems that through drive in level of parking for resident and locate the proposed cycle parking on a visitors bay.

**Austral Street**

- Yes it has got slightly worse. In particular visits parking at the weekends. On Austral Street there is also a proposed cycle shed which I support but the exclusion of a residuary space. My recommendation would be to maintain the same.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Lamlash Street, included in this should actually be removed or reduced as having a different status (pedestrian and cycle only). The space is a community garden. Ideally we would like to see a parking restriction/reduced parking along here also makes it difficult to get to your destination. My recommendation would be to maintain the same level of parking for residents and locate the proposed cycle parking on a visitors bay.

- ideally we would like to see a parking restriction/reduced parking along here also makes it difficult to get to your destination. My recommendation would be to maintain the same level of parking for residents and locate the proposed cycle parking on a visitors bay.

- parking along here makes it difficult to get to your destination. My recommendation would be to maintain the same level of parking for residents and locate the proposed cycle parking on a visitors bay.

**Borough Road**

- I am a Borough Road resident and we have a car. We have a C2 parking permit. My husband (the driver of this household) uses it on a regular basis. Parking along here makes it difficult to get to your destination. My recommendation would be to maintain the same level of parking for residents and locate the proposed cycle parking on a visitors bay.

**Borough Road**

- Borough Road gets particularly busy in the evenings at weekends with people parking to visit ministry of sound around the corner and taxis dropping off people up.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brook Drive</td>
<td>06/09/2015</td>
<td>Yes, it has got worse on Brook Drive. Finding a spot at any time has got more difficult, and especially at weekends with people parking for the War Museum and the Tabernacle Church. Extending the hours to cover weekends would seem sensible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Drive</td>
<td>22/10/2015</td>
<td>The parking on Brook Drive was already difficult for residents outside of the restricted times due to large numbers of church visitors at the weekend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Drive</td>
<td>22/01/2016</td>
<td>Review parking on Friday evening or Saturday's in Brook Drive area is nearly an impossible task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Drive</td>
<td>25/01/2016</td>
<td>The parking on Brook Drive was already difficult for residents outside of the restricted times due to large numbers of church visitors at the weekend. I am disappointed that this was not something that was flagged as an obvious potential problem earlier in the process when the leisure centre was being built. It is essential that something is done for local residents and then extended to other areas within the zone, so all residents are likely to feel the effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Drive</td>
<td>29/01/2016</td>
<td>Yes, it has got worse on Brook Drive. Finding a spot at any time has got more difficult, and especially at weekends with people parking for the War Museum and the Tabernacle Church. Extending the hours to cover weekends would seem sensible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Drive</td>
<td>29/01/2016</td>
<td>Review parking on Friday evening or Saturday's in Brook Drive area is nearly an impossible task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Drive</td>
<td>09/02/2016</td>
<td>Parking in Austral Street is difficult during the week. There are several pay spaces which seem to be rarely used - perhaps these could be converted to residents' bays? Extending restrictions beyond 9pm would probably help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Drive</td>
<td>09/02/2016</td>
<td>Review parking on Friday evening or Saturday's in Brook Drive area is nearly an impossible task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Drive</td>
<td>10/02/2016</td>
<td>Parking near to the house has become increasingly difficult in the last year. The zone does seem to be a large one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook Drive</td>
<td>15/02/2016</td>
<td>Review parking on Friday evening or Saturday's in Brook Drive area is nearly an impossible task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Pre-consultation (PCR) or Consultation Response (CR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clennam Street</td>
<td>14/11/2015</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22/01/2016</td>
<td>PCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15/07/2016</td>
<td>CR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The northern boundary seems odd to say the least. Either end it at Marshalsea Road or continue it up to Southwark Street. The madness and I have mentioned before is the one wey cross way of Ayers Street as this is the northern boundary line. However if we do a one way system surely everyone living Ayers Street is still so we need more bays (or the zone be extended) it is difficult for those residents who live in Redcross Way. I am a car owner (with resident’s permit) who is required to park in Ayers Street or Marshalsea Road (closest bays to my residence). The issue is that the Northern end of the C2 CPZ needs to include Union Street (presently in C1 CPZ). We have lost several bays recently due mainly to construction. I recently was towed off a residence bay – when no sign cessation of bay sign was present, on Marshalsea road by the police and deposited in the pay and display bay outside the Old Firestation. It was only by luck when I went to go get my car, some builders told me that the police had moved it. Further lucky still is was able to issue a ticket for parking and displaying (which I didn’t even know my car had been moved). I am a car owner with resident’s permit who is required to park in Ayers Street or Marshalsea Road (closest bays to my residence). The issue is that the Northern end of the C2 CPZ needs to include Union Street (presently in C1 CPZ). We have lost several bays recently due mainly to construction. I recently was towed off a residence bay – when no sign cessation of bay sign was present, on Marshalsea road by the police and deposited in the pay and display bay outside the Old Firestation. It was only by luck when I went to go get my car, some builders told me that the police had moved it. Further lucky still is was able to issue a ticket for parking and displaying (which I didn’t even know my car had been moved).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Pre consultation (PCR) or Consultation Response (CR)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaywood Street</td>
<td>24/02/2016</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-consultation (PCR) or Consultation Response (CR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Street Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gaywood Street**

We often have problems parking close to our address. This is worsened by the area being close to our home. Our primary parking zone is a result of increases in the number of weekend traffic, which is often very time consuming.

Although there may be benefits to extending the hours of the restrictions and increasing the number of parking spaces, there are also some concerns. EF: It is much harder for residents to park. People accessing the number of parking spaces will either rely on the traffic zone or use other means of transport. I think the situation has worsened recently, with all the new works in the area. We always have been able to park in the area for around 10 years. I think the situation has worsened recently, with all the new works in the area. We always have been able to park in the area for around 10 years. We also rely on the traffic zone or use other means of transport.

**Gaywood Street**

We often have problems parking close to our address. This is worsened by the area being close to our home. Our primary parking zone is a result of increases in the number of weekend traffic, which is often very time consuming.

Although there may be benefits to extending the hours of the restrictions and increasing the number of parking spaces, there are also some concerns. EF: It is much harder for residents to park. People accessing the number of parking spaces will either rely on the traffic zone or use other means of transport. I think the situation has worsened recently, with all the new works in the area. We always have been able to park in the area for around 10 years. I think the situation has worsened recently, with all the new works in the area. We always have been able to park in the area for around 10 years. We also rely on the traffic zone or use other means of transport.

**Gaywood Street**

We often have problems parking close to our address. This is worsened by the area being close to our home. Our primary parking zone is a result of increases in the number of weekend traffic, which is often very time consuming.

Although there may be benefits to extending the hours of the restrictions and increasing the number of parking spaces, there are also some concerns. EF: It is much harder for residents to park. People accessing the number of parking spaces will either rely on the traffic zone or use other means of transport. I think the situation has worsened recently, with all the new works in the area. We always have been able to park in the area for around 10 years. I think the situation has worsened recently, with all the new works in the area. We always have been able to park in the area for around 10 years. We also rely on the traffic zone or use other means of transport.

**Gaywood Street**

We often have problems parking close to our address. This is worsened by the area being close to our home. Our primary parking zone is a result of increases in the number of weekend traffic, which is often very time consuming.

Although there may be benefits to extending the hours of the restrictions and increasing the number of parking spaces, there are also some concerns. EF: It is much harder for residents to park. People accessing the number of parking spaces will either rely on the traffic zone or use other means of transport. I think the situation has worsened recently, with all the new works in the area. We always have been able to park in the area for around 10 years. I think the situation has worsened recently, with all the new works in the area. We always have been able to park in the area for around 10 years. We also rely on the traffic zone or use other means of transport.

**Gaywood Street**

We often have problems parking close to our address. This is worsened by the area being close to our home. Our primary parking zone is a result of increases in the number of weekend traffic, which is often very time consuming.

Although there may be benefits to extending the hours of the restrictions and increasing the number of parking spaces, there are also some concerns. EF: It is much harder for residents to park. People accessing the number of parking spaces will either rely on the traffic zone or use other means of transport. I think the situation has worsened recently, with all the new works in the area. We always have been able to park in the area for around 10 years. I think the situation has worsened recently, with all the new works in the area. We always have been able to park in the area for around 10 years. We also rely on the traffic zone or use other means of transport.

**Gaywood Street**

We often have problems parking close to our address. This is worsened by the area being close to our home. Our primary parking zone is a result of increases in the number of weekend traffic, which is often very time consuming.

Although there may be benefits to extending the hours of the restrictions and increasing the number of parking spaces, there are also some concerns. EF: It is much harder for residents to park. People accessing the number of parking spaces will either rely on the traffic zone or use other means of transport. I think the situation has worsened recently, with all the new works in the area. We always have been able to park in the area for around 10 years. I think the situation has worsened recently, with all the new works in the area. We always have been able to park in the area for around 10 years. We also rely on the traffic zone or use other means of transport.

**Gaywood Street**

We often have problems parking close to our address. This is worsened by the area being close to our home. Our primary parking zone is a result of increases in the number of weekend traffic, which is often very time consuming.

Although there may be benefits to extending the hours of the restrictions and increasing the number of parking spaces, there are also some concerns. EF: It is much harder for residents to park. People accessing the number of parking spaces will either rely on the traffic zone or use other means of transport. I think the situation has worsened recently, with all the new works in the area. We always have been able to park in the area for around 10 years. I think the situation has worsened recently, with all the new works in the area. We always have been able to park in the area for around 10 years. We also rely on the traffic zone or use other means of transport.

**Gaywood Street**

We often have problems parking close to our address. This is worsened by the area being close to our home. Our primary parking zone is a result of increases in the number of weekend traffic, which is often very time consuming.

Although there may be benefits to extending the hours of the restrictions and increasing the number of parking spaces, there are also some concerns. EF: It is much harder for residents to park. People accessing the number of parking spaces will either rely on the traffic zone or use other means of transport. I think the situation has worsened recently, with all the new works in the area. We always have been able to park in the area for around 10 years. I think the situation has worsened recently, with all the new works in the area. We always have been able to park in the area for around 10 years. We also rely on the traffic zone or use other means of transport.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Pre-consultation (PCR) or Consultation Response</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Street</td>
<td>30/01/2016</td>
<td>PCR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayles Street (2)</td>
<td>16/11/2015</td>
<td>PCR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Street</td>
<td>29/01/2016</td>
<td>PCR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gladstone Street**

Parking has got more difficult in the past year. Weekends especially because of the Tabernacle Sunday School.

I personally would like to see restrictions 7 days per week.

29/01/2016

**Hayles Street (2)**

People will also be coming from other areas to use swimming baths etc resulting in further pressure on spaces.

At weekends it is almost impossible to park or move my car as people come to park and use buses to gain access to west end.

People will also be coming from other areas to use swimming baths etc resulting in further pressure on spaces.

If is frustrating that amount of local businesses that have been allowed to obtain residents permits and that more control is needed.

Revew every year.

For 8 years now and have found it increasingly more difficult to park in the street. I am a resident permit holder and

30/01/2016

**Gray Street**

In recent years the northern part of the Borough has seen increased parking at weekends due to the growth in visitors to the Southbank and Borough Market.

In recent years the northern part of the Borough has seen increased parking at weekends and in the evenings.

This does mean that it can be difficult to find a parking space at weekends and in the evenings.

More specifically in Waterloo there has been an increase in parking at weekends from hotel guests (there are now 3 new hotels in Waterloo Road alone since the 2004 review) and in the evening from people attending the Old Vic.

28/01/2016

**Gray Street**

Ideally I would like controls Mon-Sun 08:30-18:30

It also think that where there are narrow roads with wide pavements that recessed parking bays are preferable.
Hayles Street
28/01/2016
PCR
We have lived in Hayles Street for 17 years. The availability of parking spaces over recent years has become a problem particularly at weekends. If we take our car out of the street at weekends it is impossible to park again until either late evening or the next morning. We normally have to park in West Square. We also see cars with two residents parking permits on display for other London boroughs in addition to Southwark. There are also residents with more than one car and a number of vehicles with licensed mini cab drivers and we can’t have that many taxi drivers in our street. There are also commercial vehicles with C2 permits, approximately three vans. There is no “policing” of the double yellow lines. When we first moved in, tickets were issued to parking offenders, but not this is not as frequent as it was some years ago. The Tabernacle take spaces over the weekend and with the leisure centre opening in April, the problem will become intolerable.
We need to move to the same approach as other London boroughs where parking is also restricted at weekends so the people who live in the street and pay to park, can actually do so.

King Edward Walk
25/01/2016
PCR
It is impossible to park on the southwark side of King Edward Walk between 6.30pm on Saturdays and 8.30am on Sundays to drive my car back onto the Camden Mental Hospital private road 6.30pm on Saturdays and 8.30am on Sundays to drive my car back onto the Camden Mental Hospital private road at weekends as I cannot find a space and then I park arrangement to park in the Camden Mental Hospital parking road at weekends as I cannot find a space.
We are bringing to your attention the problem and your vision to the Imperial War Museum. Personally I have no problem as Sunday is the day to do my weekly shop at Tesco or visit my daughter in Clapham, or go shopping on Saturdays in the C2 Residents Parking Bay. As is the rule of the road. Our tarred surface of King Edward Walk is too narrow for parking on both sides. Therefore, the four car owners in our terrace have an informal arrangement to park in the Cambian Mental Hospital private road at weekends if I cannot find a space. This is not difficult when the parking restrictions are in operation. However, is impossible to find a parking space on King Edward Walk. The Tabernacle have a car arrangement in their car parks however have to park on my car in the Imperial War Museum.
Therefore, the four car owners in our terrace who have an informal arrangement to park on King Edward Walk, opposite the Imperial War Museum were unable to do so.
It is impossible to park on the southwark side of King Edward Walk opposite our terrace due to the fact that Lambeth is the only borough with different parking restrictions. Lambeth Parking is back to the Camden Mental Hospital private road 6.30pm on Saturdays and 8.30am on Sundays to drive my car back onto the Camden Mental Hospital private road at weekends as I cannot find a space and then I park.
King Edward Walk
2/02/2016
PCR
Without being repetitive, we endorse all the concerns outlined to you in her email to you dated 25 January. These include the virtual impossibility of parking on the Southwark side of King Edward Walk, and the pressure on residents’ parking spaces in C2 in designated bays opposite the Imperial War Museum, St George’s Road, Morley Street and Gerridge Street when parking restrictions are not in operation (mostly weekends). As she indicated, it is also totally ludicrous that Southwark and Lambeth have set different parking restrictions over the weekend in King Edward Walk, catching out many unwary but responsible people trying to park their cars.

Lant Street
23/01/2016
PCR
Stop suspending bays for long periods for no reason
Some ability to park
Extend bays to later evenings and the weekend - so residents have more bays
To summarise: when I’m away for 30 minutes trying to park, the things would not be there when I got back, simple trip to B&Q for plants, so can’t carry heavy things for a while to get to my front door. Plus can’t drop anything off, parking all over the single yellows. I would like to be able to use my car and deliver things to close to my front door. That’s why I am a resident.

Lant Street
14/11/2015
PCR
Stop suspending bays for long periods for no reason
More bays
The Northern area of C2 is extremely congested now. I can’t do a simple trip to B&Q for plants, so can’t carry heavy things for a while to get to my front door.

Lant Street
PCR
I’m on Lant Street, Borough tube end - I can’t park at all the weekend for all the non-resident cars coming to the area and parking all over the single yellows. (I realise the resident bays are not active at the weekends - however it would be good if some were.) I would like to be able to use my car and deliver things to close to my front door. That’s why I am a resident.

To summarise:
Street Name: Lant Street
Date: 26/01/2016
Pre-consultation (PCR) or Consultation Response (CR)

There are probably only 4-6 local spaces available for the entire east side of Lant Street. Marshalsea Road has a few more available but these have been denuded by the bus stands and obviously serve the residents along that stretch of road, including properties on Sanctuary Street and Disney Place opposite. Not sure how the council can, in good conscience, issue a car parking permit when there are no local places to parking your car! I suppose it depends on how far they feel it is reasonable to walk after you've parked your car. There are yellow lines directly outside our property that could be converted to parking spaces except the school have managed to claim that as well. They are a special case, also part of a conservation area. Parking in our street is alreadyflagrantly abused by commercial enterprises. The any solution worth considering is access only parking 7 days per week. This would have to be considered against the access needs of the residents in a position to use the spaces. The only solution worth considering is access only parking 7 days per week with residents in a position to use the spaces.

Street Name: Lant Street
Date: 29/01/2016
Pre-consultation (PCR) or Consultation Response (CR)

I am experiencing problems parking and the situation has worsened considerably during the time I have been living in the area.

Street Name: Lant Street
Date: 26/01/2016
Pre-consultation (PCR) or Consultation Response (CR)

There are probably only 4-6 local spaces available for the entire east side of Lant Street. Marshalsea Road has a few more available but these have been denuded by the bus stands and obviously serve the residents along that stretch of road, including properties on Sanctuary Street and Disney Place opposite. Not sure how the council can, in good conscience, issue a car parking permit when there are no local places to parking your car! I suppose it depends on how far they feel it is reasonable to walk after you've parked your car. There are yellow lines directly outside our property that could be converted to parking spaces except the school have managed to claim that as well. They are a special case, also part of a conservation area. Parking in our street is alreadyflagrantly abused by commercial enterprises. The any solution worth considering is access only parking 7 days per week. This would have to be considered against the access needs of the residents in a position to use the spaces. The only solution worth considering is access only parking 7 days per week with residents in a position to use the spaces.

Street Name: Oswin Street
Date: 16/11/2015
Pre-consultation (PCR) or Consultation Response (CR)

Oswin St is a special case, also part of a conservation area. Parking in our street is alreadyflagrantly abused by commercial enterprises. The any solution worth considering is access only parking 7 days per week. This would have to be considered against the access needs of the residents in a position to use the spaces. The only solution worth considering is access only parking 7 days per week with residents in a position to use the spaces.

Street Name: Oswin Street
Date: 17/11/2015
Pre-consultation (PCR) or Consultation Response (CR)

yes we do need to change the parking times, and make it seven day parking like they do in the Kings rd.

Oswin Street
17/11/2015
PCR

The CPZ operates Monday to Friday from 8.30am to 6.30pm but the area is popular with visitors on Saturday making it impossible to park at weekends.

The CPZ needs to be in operation seven days a week and resident days that have been lost need to be reinstated or replaced.

The CPZ needs to be in operation seven days a week and resident days that have been lost need to be reinstated or replaced.

Oswin St is a special case, also part of a conservation area. Parking in our street is alreadyflagrantly abused by commercial enterprises. The any solution worth considering is access only parking 7 days per week. This would have to be considered against the access needs of the residents in a position to use the spaces. The only solution worth considering is access only parking 7 days per week with residents in a position to use the spaces.
But I would say that appears we are close to capacity as it takes 3-4 drive around to find a free bay at times.

I am a newish resident to the area and have not experienced too much of a problem parking so far.

For delivery vehicles to residential premises, and the number of contractors deploying to all the surrounding buildings.

I vote that damages suffered that it was a Help with which, not in ordinary care. The council has served a notice on the landlord to repair the wall. In each case the

5. A related problem has been that 3 years in the past 2 years my small car has been damaged while parked in the road. By drivers

private function on Saturdays. I think it may help if permits were extended on Saturdays.

are taken by people wishing the area to stand a function. In the postscript following, where rooms are taken let for

I have also experienced problems especially if leaving with the car on Saturdays, and there are no spaces because many

theatre-like as we are close to the Cur.

There should be more space given over to residents' parking and the hours should be extended as we suffer from

5. The structure of the time we have been living in the area (8 years) would be 12 hours per day. The situation has

are building contractors, vehicles using spaces and parking suspended in some areas because of building work.

We are currently experiencing problems parking. The consultation takes and suspension does leave problems.

We are currently experiencing problems parking. The consultation takes and suspension does leave problems.

5. A related problem has been that 3 times in the past 3 years my small car has been damaged while parked in the road. By drivers

These cars and they are driving on our street as base. With the high rise buildings we will have a nightmare on our street. It

this situation continues.

Also Friday and Saturday nights is problematic. More motorist are using parking spaces in our street (to attend the Ministry of

My position is to make the residents pay 24 hours, I have noticed that our street become increasingly noisy/irritating.
Redcross Way
28/01/2016
PCR
Although I have to be honest and say I hope to goodness that doesn’t mean even fewer parking spaces for Recross Way - they’ve halved the number

Southwark Bridge Road
26/01/2016
PCR
We own one car and have a C2 permit. Having the cpz extension will mean the parking in C2 will become even worse to park as I have to

St George’s Road
24/01/2016
PCR
Sometimes don’t use my car because it is impossible to park easier to leave where is Blah Blah Blah parking spaces are all.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St George's Road</td>
<td>28/01/2016</td>
<td>PCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In respect of experiencing problems parking, generally at the top end of St George's Road, there is enough parking for residents. However, when I first moved to the area in 1983, the residents parking allowed parking by non-residents in the evenings, but was not limited to weekdays. A few years ago, the Council did some roadworks opposite the Cathedral and, for a while, the parking signs were removed. When they were reinstated, the signs had been changed and non-resident parking was extended to weekends. Now, if any resident moves their car at the weekend, it is very unlikely that they will be able to find a space when they return. More visitors to the area would certainly exacerbate the problem. If I was reviewing any part of the C2 CPZ, I would make all residents parking for permit holders only at all times, like it used to be! The residents do pay for this service, but the area attracts a lot of visitors at the weekends and, these days, the parking bays fill up from very early on, especially on a Saturday. There are quite a few single yellow lines (could there be more?) in the area which are available for parking at the weekends, so perhaps some new residents could use these.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Webber Street
30/06/2016
PCR

Many thanks for your email and for the update on the CPZ consultation. I would like to respond as a non-car owner.

We have had 2 issues in the last month where service suppliers have had trouble parking on Webber St. One drove for about 40 minutes before finding a space, the other had to leave without being able to come to do the job we had paid for. There is a need to provide short-term parking (1-2 hours) for service vehicles (electricians, plumbers, etc). Otherwise, businesses will suffer and we won’t be able to access appropriate services.

I will keep an eye out for the consultation.

Westminster Bridge Road
28/01/2016
PCR

I am a car owner with a resident’s permit and mostly park on Gerridge Street, SE1. Parking is not normally an issue except on a Saturday afternoon when the street becomes clogged with parked vehicles taking advantage of the fact that the controlled hours finish at 12 midday or thereabouts. I am often away with work on Fridays and struggle to park on a Saturday afternoon in Gerridge Street or Morley Street on my return.

West Square
17/11/2015

• A review after the Leisure Centre is open makes sense.
• Extra CPZ parking spaces would be great.
• Bel and I are against weekend restrictions in West Sq. It is hard enough to park during the week let alone having to search for spaces on the weekend - it is hard enough to park during the week for both the car and the leisure centre.

• We also really appreciate that the elderly grandparents can visit on the weekends without cost. They are already penalised by the fact that we are in the C Charge and have to pay £10 for a weekday visit to the church and leisure centre.

• Maybe after the opening and with extra spaces we will become less divided.

West Square
29/01/2016

PCR

The situation is a la crêperie where we thought we’d have a deal but now there are no deals on our agreement to relocate, getting stuck in traffic delaying tourists and commuters.

They are putting in additional parking spaces, which we will welcome on Monday.

We decided to park on the other side of the road, which is what we did last year before the extension and have to pay £10 for a weekend visit to the church. We also made a few requests that the church authorities put on extra parking spaces from the church parking.

We hope that the church is able to make some concessions.

Bel and I would be against weekend restrictions in West Sq. It is hard enough to park during the week let alone having to search for spaces on the weekend - it is hard enough to park during the week let alone having to search for spaces on the weekend.

Additional parking spaces would be great.

A review after the Leisure Centre is open makes sense.
West Square (2) 17/11/2015 CR

However, there is a related issue which really needs to be addressed. Partly because of all the roadworks and changes at the Elephant, Brook Drive has become a very busy rat run, used by traffic coming off Kennington Road. Cars are densely parked on both sides of the road which, as you know, is half Southwark half Lambeth, with the boundary down the centre of the road. The result is that there are almost continuous traffic jams in Brook Drive, which can only be negotiated slowly and with considerable difficulty. The obvious answer would be to remove the gate into Sullivan Road, making Brook Drive one way from Kennington Road and Sullivan Road one way to Kennington Road. I realise that this falls into Lambeth territory, but the current situation does need to be resolved.

Parking in West Square is frequently impossible and the situation has worsened considerably in recent years. Firstly, the residents' parking spaces in Geraldine Street were lost when the bicycle racks were introduced and no replacement provision was made. Secondly, the number of visitors to the area, especially at weekends, has increased due to the refurbishment of the Imperial War Museum and increased shopping activity around the Elephant and Castle. The Square and surrounding roads (especially Dante Road and Brook Drive) are also used as turn out areas by drivers going from the Elephant to Kennington Road and vice versa. I would favour extending the controlled hours only if considerably more parking spaces were available. I present this issue home and hope that action is taken as I can find no alternative.

West Square 29/01/2016 PCR

Yes, it is more difficult, but we only need a few more spaces to make it. These could easily be created by just extending the existing bays by a few feet.

West Square 28/07/2016 CR

Parking in West Square is frequently impossible and the situation has worsened considerably in recent years. Firstly, the residents' parking spaces in Geraldine Street were lost when the bicycle racks were introduced and no replacement provision was made. Secondly, the number of visitors to the area, especially at weekends, has increased due to the refurbishment of the Imperial War Museum and increased shopping activity around the Elephant and Castle. The Square and surrounding roads (especially Dante Road and Brook Drive) are also used as turn out areas by drivers going from the Elephant to Kennington Road and vice versa. I would favour extending the controlled hours only if considerably more parking spaces were available. I present this issue home and hope that action is taken as I can find no alternative.

West Square 20/03/2016 PCR

I would very much like to see more residents’ parking in the West Square area, such as in Geraldine Street where there is room for cars as well. It would be fantastic for several of the 6 cars. These were removed when the Boris bikes were introduced but there would still be plenty of space and there are parks on either side of the road as well. In my opinion the area looks very bare, but I realise that this job is lengthy.

West Square 17/11/2015 CR

However, there is a related issue which really needs to be addressed. I'm only aware of the roadworks and changes at the Elephant, Brook Drive has become a very busy rat run, used by traffic coming off Kennington Road. Cars are densely parked on both sides of the road which, as you know, is half Southwark half Lambeth, with the boundary down the centre of the road. I realise that this falls into Lambeth territory, but the current situation does need to be resolved.

West Square 17/11/2015 CR

Parking in West Square is frequently impossible and the situation has worsened considerably in recent years. Firstly, the residents’ parking spaces in Geraldine Street were lost when the bicycle racks were introduced and no replacement provision was made. Secondly, the number of visitors to the area, especially at weekends, has increased due to the refurbishment of the Imperial War Museum and increased shopping activity around the Elephant and Castle. The Square and surrounding roads (especially Dante Road and Brook Drive) are also used as turn out areas by drivers going from the Elephant to Kennington Road and vice versa. I would favour extending the controlled hours only if considerably more parking spaces were available. I present this issue home and hope that action is taken as I can find no alternative.

West Square 17/11/2015 CR

Parking in West Square is frequently impossible and the situation has worsened considerably in recent years. Firstly, the residents’ parking spaces in Geraldine Street were lost when the bicycle racks were introduced and no replacement provision was made. Secondly, the number of visitors to the area, especially at weekends, has increased due to the refurbishment of the Imperial War Museum and increased shopping activity around the Elephant and Castle. The Square and surrounding roads (especially Dante Road and Brook Drive) are also used as turn out areas by drivers going from the Elephant to Kennington Road and vice versa. I would favour extending the controlled hours only if considerably more parking spaces were available. I present this issue home and hope that action is taken as I can find no alternative.
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