


Lucas Gardens and Southampton Way 1st and 2nd stage CPZ consultation report

June 2011

www.southwark.gov.uk



Cashless parking

Civil enforcement officer

Car club bay

Residents' permit

Loading bay

Disabled parking

Pay and display

Lucas Gardens and Southampton Way 1st and 2nd stage CPZ consultation report

June 2011

www.southwark.gov.uk

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

Section A – Introduction	3
Section B – Study methods and decision making	4
Background of study	4
History of parking consultations in the area	5
Project structure	6
Consultation area	6
Existing parking arrangements in LG area	8
Existing parking arrangements in SW area	8
Consultation document.....	9
Public exhibitions	10
Further information	10
Parking surveys	10
Section C – Consultation questionnaire results summary	11
Summary of response rate	11
Headline consultation results for Lucas Gardens.....	13
Headline consultation results for Southampton Way.....	20
Communications made outside of the Freepost questionnaire	28
Section D – Parking stress survey summary.....	30
Headline results (LG).....	30
Headline results (SW).....	30
Section E – Study conclusions and recommendations.....	34
Options - LG	35
Options - SW	35
List of appendices	36
Version control.....	36

Section A – Introduction

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

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

The PEP was adopted as an appendix to the council's overall transport strategy, the Local Implementation Plan² (LIP). Amongst a variety of transport objectives, the LIP sets out the council's aim to relieve congestion on our roads whilst recognising that motor vehicles play an important part in many people's lives and need to be catered for within our road network.

The LIP notes that congestion can be tackled through a combination of strategies – one of which is managing demand for travel through parking regulation.

Parking is the end result of a trip. The availability of parking at a destination has a clear effect on whether the trip is made by car or not. Existing parking controls all across Southwark already assist in improving traffic and congestion levels. The controls provide another significant tool that can be used to help control the use of the private car. This, in turn, provides benefits in terms of vehicular emissions, traffic congestion and social inclusion and maintenance costs.

The LIP (and its replacement, the emerging Transport Plan 2011³) fit within the wider context, at a regional level, of the Mayor's Transport Strategy⁴.

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

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

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

⁴ <http://www.london.gov.uk/shaping-london/>

Section B – Study methods and decision making

Background of study

The PEP⁵ identifies the study areas as locations which may justify consideration of a new zone. The PEP describes these two areas as residential areas in which there is a high density of car ownership and there are also concentrations of employment. Another consideration is both areas' proximity to other controlled parking zones (EC, L and NC).

Network development carried out a first stage ('in-principal') consultation and analysis of an area of uncontrolled streets (non-CPZ) known as East Camberwell / West Peckham in September 2006.

Two areas showed support and were progressed to 2nd stage (detailed design) consultation, East Camberwell and Lucas Gardens (LG). This took place in November 2007.

In June/July 2008 – CPZ draft report/plans presented to Camberwell Community Council and the key decision was taken by the director of environment and housing agreeing the detailed layout and to introduce EC CPZ only. As a result of late representations from residents the decision was taken not to proceed with the introduction of the LG CPZ and Camberwell Community Council asked that LG area be monitored during the EC traffic orders experimental period.

In April 2009 EC CPZ was introduced as an experimental traffic order. In September 2010 EC CPZ traffic order was made permanent.

The council's 2010-12 network development programme was approved in June 2010 by the cabinet member for environment and transport. Pertinently, this included a parking consultation of residents and businesses in streets around the periphery of the existing EC CPZ.

The reason to re-consult is based upon a commitment⁶ to monitor parking around the periphery of EC CPZ for a period of 18 months, following the operational commencement of EC CPZ. It was agreed that a further one-stage consultation be carried out should substantial representations be made in the area (during the review period).

During the 18 month period, officers completed two spot parking-occupancy surveys that showed an increase in parking demand in surrounding roads.

All streets within the Lucas Gardens area and Parkhouse Street⁷ (noted that this is a boundary road between Camberwell and Walworth community council) have recently required the installation of double yellow lines on all junctions and bends to prevent dangerous/obstructive parking. This is a familiar indicator that parking pressure is high.

Furthermore, the council has received continued correspondence on the matter, the vast majority of which can be summarised as asking the council to re-consult / introduce a CPZ. This has included a 288

⁵ Chapter 4.3, Parking and Enforcement Plan, Southwark Council

⁶ Lucas Gardens controlled parking zone 2nd stage report, August 2008

⁷ Parkhouse Street is a boundary road between Walworth and Camberwell community council

signature petition⁸, Councillor and MP enquiries and officer's attendance to Wilson's Tenant's and Resident's Association Meeting (July 16 2009).

History of parking consultations in the area

Area	Date	Consultation	Outcome
EC and WP	2006/7	1 st stage consultation, extending approximately from Camberwell Green to Peckham Hill Street and St Georges Way to Lyndhurst Grove.	Decision to progress to 2 nd stage consultation in supportive area of EC and LG only.
EC and LG	2007/8	2 nd stage consultation in those areas identified in support during 2006 1 st stage consultation.	EC and LG 2 nd stage consultation. LG does not progress to implementation due to substantial comments against the scheme at Camberwell community council
EC only	April 2009	EC CPZ experimental traffic order made.	Camberwell Community Council asked that LG be monitored during EC experimental period.
EC only	September 2010	EC CPZ traffic order made permanent	Desktop review carried out experimental CPZ considered successful, TMO made permanent
LG and SW	2010/11	Combined 1 st and 2 nd stage consultation with: LG area includes Grace's Road, Grace's Mews, Vestry Road, Dagmar Road, Wilson Road and Maude Road SW area includes Southampton Way, Parkhouse Street, Wells Way, Coleman Road, Bonsor Street, Rainbow Street, Tilson Close, Cottage Green, Chiswell Street and Dowlas Street	

⁸ Noted that 31 signatures were from addresses outside the recommended consultation area

Project structure

Since adoption of the PEP, the council carries out its CPZ projects by way of a two-stage consultation process⁹, except where the area limits are predetermined by physical, borough or existing CPZ boundaries or by budget constraints - in which case a joint 1st/2nd stage consultation may be carried out. In this case the boundaries for LG were already defined by the earlier consultation and in SW physical and budget set the boundary, therefore a combine 1st and 2nd stage consultation was carried out.

First and second stage (combined) CPZ consultation

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

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

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

We will also ask our key stakeholders for their comments.

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

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

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

More detail of the process is shown in Figure 1.

Consultation area

A presentation of the consultation strategy was given and approved at Camberwell Community Council on 22 September 2010 and ward members from Faraday Ward were notified by email on 1 October 2010.

The streets approved for consultation are situated within Brunswick Park, Camberwell Green and Faraday Wards.

Parkhouse Street and northern section of Southampton Way are boundary roads between Camberwell and Walworth community councils.

⁹ http://www.southwark.gov.uk/YourServices/transport/parking/cpzreviews/CPZ_how_consult/

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




Figure 1

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

Existing parking arrangements in LG area

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

- Road safety and traffic management measures – e.g. At any time waiting restrictions - on all junctions within the consultation area
- Origin disabled parking bays – 3 installed outside residents homes who meet the council's criteria
- Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) – Wilson Road and Vestry Road
- Vehicle crossovers – 24 allow access to private land (i.e. residential front driveways) parking is permitted but it can be enforced against by the council at request of the landowner (certain conditions apply)

Existing parking arrangements in SW area

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

- Bus priority measures – e.g. bus stops on Southampton Way and Wells Way
- Road safety measures – e.g. formal pedestrian crossings on Southampton Way
- Local traffic management – e.g. assisting sight lines in side roads streets off Southampton Way and to improve traffic flow on Parkhouse Street
- Short term parking or loading bays – to assist turn-over of space for local business, bays located in Southampton Way and Rainbow Street
- Origin disabled parking bays – 8 installed outside residents homes who meet the council's criteria
- Vehicle crossovers – 39 allow access to private land (ie residential front driveways) parking is permitted but it can be enforced against by the council at request of the landowner (certain conditions apply)

The above controls operate within the consultation area. Additionally, there are CPZs in the surrounding neighbourhood that will likely have influence upon the supply of on-street parking through the effects of displacement.

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

Consultation document

602 and 621 addresses are located within the LG and SW consultation areas respectively. This data was derived from the council's Local Land and Property Gazetteer (LLPG).

Distribution of the consultation documents (appendix 2 and 3) was made on 10 December 2010 by way of a blanket hand-delivery to all (residential and commercial) properties within the two consultation areas. The delivery was carried out by a leaflet distribution company - London Letterbox.

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

The document was designed to present information on:

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

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

- Their address
- Whether they park (on-street)
- Current ability to park
- When problems occur
- Whether their opinion would change if a CPZ was introduced in an adjacent street
- Initial design
- Hours/days of enforcement
- Any other comments

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

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

Documents were delivered on 10 December 2010 and the response period ran until 14 January 2011 (the usual period of 3 weeks for such consultations was extended because of the Christmas period). Officers accepted and inputted responses up to 31 January 2011.

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

Public exhibitions

The network development team held three public exhibitions on,

- Thursday 16 December 2010 - 4pm to 8pm at the Southwark Town Hall,
- Saturday 8 January 2011 - 10am to 2pm at the Elmington Tenants and Residents Association Hall
- Thursday 13 January 2011 - 4.30pm to 8pm at the Southwark Town Hall

Further information

70 street notices were erected within the two consultation areas at the end of the 1st week of consultation (10 December 2010). A copy of the street notices and reminder street notices are found in appendix 4. The notice provided contact details (telephone and email) for more detail on the consultation and advice of what to do if consultation packs had not been received. An additional 70 reminder street notices were erected within the two consultation areas at the before the last week of the consultation (3 January 2011)

The council's parking consultation webpage¹⁰ was also updated with detail of the active consultation, its process and how decisions would be taken. A selection of frequently asked questions in relation to CPZs also provided an additional source of information for those making enquiries as to what a CPZ could mean to them.

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

Parking surveys

To quantify the parking situation, Count on Us were commissioned to undertake parking surveys on a weekday 4 November 2010 (appendix 5.1) and a Saturday 6 November 2010 (appendix 5.2) to ascertain parking occupancy and duration of stay on all 14 public highway roads within the two study areas.

¹⁰ <http://www.southwark.gov.uk/YourServices/transport/parking/cpzreviews/>

Section C – Consultation questionnaire results summary

Summary of response rate

Figure 2.1 shows that the LG consultation yielded 136 returned questionnaires, representing a 22.6% response rate and figure 2.2 shows SW consultation yielded 94 returned questionnaires, representing 15.1%. For LG, this is an excellent response rate for this type of consultation when compared with similar consultations in the borough and benchmarked against other London authorities. For SW this is an average response rate, consistent with similar consultation elsewhere in the borough.

In LG the highest response rate was from Grace's Mews (70%), the lowest was Camberwell Church Road with no responses.

In SW the highest response rate was from Dowlas Street (44.4%), the lowest were Newent Close, Harris Street, Havil Street, Benhill Road and Sedgemoor Place with no responses. Apart from Newent Close the other streets listed are part of East Camberwell CPZ; this may explain the lack of responses.

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

A further 53 comments were made either by email, letter or phone.

LG Area Street	Delivered	Returned	Response rate	Telephone	Email/letter	Total responses to consultation
Dagmar Road	89	32	36%	2	1	35
Camberwell Church Road	24	0	0%	0	0	0
Grace's Road	85	19	22%	2	1	22
Grace's Mews	10	7	70%	4	2	13
Maude Road	55	24	44%	1	6	31
Peckham Road	121	3	2%	0	4	7
Vestry Road	44	25	57%	1	0	26
Vestry Mews	41	3	7%	0	0	3
Wilson Road	133	23	17%	1	2	26
Outside consultation area	0	0	0%	0	2	2
TOTAL	602	136	22.6%	11	18	165

Figure 2.1

SW Area Street	Delivered	Returned	Response rate	Telephone	Email/letter	Total responses to consultation
Bonsor Street	19	2	11%	0	0	2
Coleman Road	107	25	23%	1	4	30
Chiswell Street	20	5	25%	1	0	6
Cottage Green	19	1	5%	0	0	1
Dowlas Street	18	8	44%	0	0	8
Parkhouse Street	41	3	7%	0	2	5
Rainbow Street	62	19	31%	1	0	20
Southampton Way	241	16	7%	4	3	23
Tilson Close	13	3	23%	0	0	3
Wells Way	45	12	27%	1	2	15
Newent Close	9	0	0%	1	0	1
Harris Street	1	0	0%	0	0	0
Havil Street	1	0	0%	0	0	0
Sedgemoor Place	14	0	0%	0	0	0
Benhill Road	11	0	0%	0	0	0
Outside consultation area	0	0	0%	0	4	4
TOTAL	621	94	15.1%	9	15	118

Figure 2.2

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

Headline consultation results for Lucas Gardens

- 1) Evaluation shows that 97.7% of responses were received from residential properties. Based upon OS land use survey data (appendix 6) this is representative of the area.
- 2) The majority of respondents have access to one or more vehicle. Only 17% of respondents in LG area don't have a vehicle. This response is unrepresentative for the ward where 50% don't have a car¹¹ and Southwark (51.9%).
- 3) Nearly three quarters, 73%, of respondents park one vehicle on the public highway, detailed in Figure 3.




Figure 3

- 4) The vast majority (79.4%) of respondents do not have any off-street parking. It is therefore assumed that the remainder (21.1%) either have private driveways, estate parking or private car parks (ie small surface car parks most usually associated with small apartment blocks).
- 5) Across the whole consultation area, when asked about *your* ability to find an on-street parking space: 32.8% found it easy or very easy, 54.2% found it difficult or very difficult. The results were very similar when asked about *your* visitor's ability to find an on-street parking, though slightly more polarised (28% v 59.2%).
- 6) Question 4 was provided to ascertain when respondents most felt parking difficulties occurred. Figure 4 details the responses. The largest response group expressed that their parking problems occurred weekdays during the daytime. The second largest group said that problems occurred during the weekday evenings, followed by Sundays.

¹¹ Office for National Statistics, Census Area Statistics, UV62




Figure 4

7) The key question of “do you want a CPZ?” is graphed in Figure 5.1 below. It is also illustrated on the following page, in a map format, as Figure 5 – this shows the street-by-street “% for” and the “% against” the proposal to introduce a CPZ, as well as the response rate for that street.





Figure 5.1

Figure 5

Do you want a CPZ and response rate

March 2011



LEGEND

- Consultation boundary
- Street majority view**
- Against
- For
- Nil response
- Street result with % response rate**
- Yes
 - No
 - Undecided

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

- 8) Those persons who responded that they didn't want a CPZ in their street were asked a further question if they would change their mind if a CPZ was to be introduced in an adjacent street. Figure 6 details the responses. The majority (59.4%) would not change their mind and wanted to keep their street uncontrolled even if a CPZ was introduced into an adjacent street.




Figure 6

- 9) An initial design drawing showing the proposed parking layout was provided in the consultation pack and comments were sought from respondents 55% of those who responded agreed with the parking bay layout and 32.1% did not.
- 10) An additional question relating to the detailed design was, "do you agree with the proposed type of parking bay?" 55.7% of those who responded agreed with design and 32.1% did not.
- 11) Of those who did not agree with the proposed type of parking bays 50% want more permit holder only bays and 30.4% wanted more short stay bays. Of note was that 15% (7) respondents to this question considered that more on-street bicycle parking was required. Whilst the initial design did not propose any, this information is valuable to the council for future schemes. Figure 7 details the responses.




Figure 7

12) If parking controls were to be introduced, the majority (55.8%) considered Monday to Friday from 8.30am to 6.30pm as their preferred choice.




Figure 8

13) Alternative suggestions ranged from 'no parking controls at all' to requests for 24/7 controls.

14) Finally, other comments were sought. Understandably, the responses given generally mirrored the view expressed to the key question of whether a CPZ was wanted or not. Figure 9 provides a random selection of comments from those in support of controls. Figure 10 provides a random selection of comments from those against controls. The text positions are indicative of the location the responses originated from.

Lucas Gardens - parking consultation

Figure 9

Additional comments from those supporting a CPZ

March 2011



"..the surrounding streets are often congested with people trawling for a space & making u turns..."

"Certain residents in Dagmar Rd routinely block spaces in the road when they go out, to keep their parking space, with wheelie bins or orange cones..."

"I feel our street is used as a bumping ground for cars that have broken down, people use this road for parking while they work. I live on this street and when I have a day off work, I can't leave my home as I can't park for hours.."

We are both "disabled and unable to walk very far it is annoying and inconvenient having sometimes to park 1 or 2 streets away as most of the car parked in our road are people who drive in park a their car and go down road & get a bus"

"It is a complete nightmare. I am self-employed and have had to completely alter the way I conduct my business due to the parking situation. I am now restricted to when I go to my clients"

"We have a baby and often go out during the day, when we get back it is often impossible to find a space anywhere near our house - then have to drive around for 30 mins waiting for a space to come free..."

"From 8 am on a week day till around 5 pm Grace's Road and the surrounding area becomes completely congested.."


"Having to walk home from parking the car for three or four streets with two young children and shopping is very frustrating."

Lucas Gardens - parking consultation

Figure 10

Additional comments from those against a CPZ

March 2011



"Government should provide free parking space available for car users. As they are paying road tax to cover wherever they park their cars and if CPZ should be introduced, it should be at a reasonable payment for parking."

"resident permit have to be free"

"The road where I live is mostly taken up during the week with council employees town hall - register office and every one is considerate polite & kind to each other, we all work well together and I have lived here many years..."

"Since double yellow lines was maked on the corners of the roads in the area it has improved the parking and driving situation. However in general there is always ample space to park in the area..."

"Always will be difficult as there will never be enough road/parking space in Wilson Road to cope with the parking needs of the multi-occupancy..."

"I think the proposed charges for residents permits are too high and even if the cpz is inforced, we as residents still wouldn't be guaranteed a parking space"

"if you were to remove the CPZ from the surrounding area's there would be a great meny more parking opportunity for person's to park and would be off benefit to all and stop people having to park in these streets in which"

"Parking can be hard around 10am-1pm during the week, making trade workers access more complicatged I rarely have trade visitors so this is not a concern for me"

"I don't want to have any parking charges in this area."

"Neither myself or any visitors have had any problems getting a parking space within 50 metres of my property. I cannot see why CPZ would be required. In ronse to Question 6, I cannot predict the effect that a CPZ would have on parking"

Headline consultation results for Southampton Way

- 15) Evaluation shows that 94.9% of responses were received from residential properties. Based upon OS land use survey data (appendix 6) this is not very representative of the area.
- 16) The majority of respondents have access to one or more vehicle. Only 11.7% of respondents don't have a vehicle. This response is unrepresentative for the ward where 54% of households don't have a car¹² and Southwark (51.9%).
- 17) Over three quarters, 78.7%, of respondents park one vehicle on the public highway (Figure 11).




Figure 11

- 18) The vast majority (86.2%) of respondents do not have any off-street parking. It is therefore assumed that the remainder (13.8%) have either private driveways or private car parks (i.e. small surface car parks most usually associated with small apartment blocks).
- 19) Across the whole consultation area, when asked about *your* ability to find an on-street parking space: 48.8% found it easy or very easy, 40.4% found it difficult or very difficult. The results were very similar when asked about *your* visitor's ability to find an on-street parking, though more polarised (39.5% v 47.2%).
- 20) Question 4 was provided to ascertain when respondents most felt parking difficulties occurred. Figure 12 details the responses. The two largest response groups expressed that their parking problems occurred weekday during the daytime and Sundays. The second largest group said that problems never occurred. .

¹² Office for National Statistics, Census Area Statistics, UV62




Figure 12

21) The key question of “do you want a CPZ?” is graphed in Figure 13.1 below. It is also illustrated on the following page, in a map format, as Figure 13 – this shows the street-by-street “% for” and the “% against” the proposal to introduce a CPZ, as well as the response rate for that street.





Figure 13.1

Figure 13

Do you want a CPZ and response rate

March 2011



LEGEND

- Consultation boundary
- Street majority view**
- Against
- For
- Nil response
- Street result with % response rate**
- Yes
- No
- Undecided

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

22) Those persons who responded that they didn't want a CPZ in a street were asked a further question if they would change their mind if a CPZ was to be introduced in an adjacent street. The majority (60.3%) would not change their mind and wanted to keep their street uncontrolled even if a CPZ was introduced into an adjacent street.




Figure 14

23) An initial design drawing showing the proposed parking layout proposed parking layout was provided in the consultation pack and comments were sought from respondents 39.1% of those who responded agreed with the parking bay layout and 41.3% did not.

24) An additional question relating to the detailed design was "do you agree with the proposed type of parking bay?" 39.1% of those who responded agreed with design and 41.3% did not, with 19.6% undecided.

25) Of those who did not agree with the proposed type of parking bays 33.3% want more permit holder only bays, 23.3% wanted more short stay bays and 26.7% wanted more shared use bays. Of note was that 26.7% (8) respondents to this question considered that more on-street bicycle parking was required and 16.7% (5) respondents considered that Car Club bays are required. Whilst the initial design did not propose any, this information is valuable to the council for future schemes. Figure 14.1 details the responses.





Figure 14.1

26) If parking controls were to be introduced, the largest response group provided an alternative suggestion. This indicates that the proposed options did not match respondent's expectations. Suggestions made ranged from 'no CPZ' to 'Monday to Sunday'



27) Finally, other comments were sought. Understandably, the responses given generally mirrored the view expressed to the key question of whether a CPZ was wanted or not. Figure 15 provides a random selection of comments from those in support of controls. Figure 16 provides a random selection of comments from those in against controls. The text positions are indicative of the location the responses originated from.

Southampton Way - parking consultation

Figure 15

Additional comments from those supporting a CPZ

March 2011



Southampton Way - parking consultation

Figure 16

Additional comments from those against a CPZ

March 2011



Communications made outside of the Freepost questionnaire

Figures 2.1 and 2.2 displays the type of communication used by all respondents during consultation.

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

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

Communications made outside the questionnaire have been included in this study and Figures 17.1 and 17.2 summarise the main purpose of the correspondence.

Adhoc communications (LG) communications	A Supports	B Against	C Another consultation document required	D Specific member request	E Other general enquiries and scanned responses
Dagmar Road	1		1		2
Camberwell Church Road					
Grace's Road	1		1		1
Grace's Mews			2		4
Maude Road		1	1		5
Peckham Road				3	
Vestry Road					1
Vestry Mews					
Wilson Road	1		1		2
Outside consultation area		3			
TOTAL	3	4	6	3	15

Figure 17.1

Adhoc communications (SW)	A	B	C	D	E
communications	Supports	Against	Another consultation document required	Specific member request	Other general enquiries and scanned responses
Bonsor Street					
Coleman Road		2	1		2
Chiswell Street	1				
Cottage Green					
Dowlas Street					
Parkhouse Street	2				
Rainbow Street					1
Southampton Way		1	4		2
Tilson Close					
Wells Way	1	1			
Newent Close			1		
Harris Street					
Havil Street					
Sedgemoor Place					
Benhill Road					
Outside consultation area		2		2	
TOTAL	4	6	6	2	5

Figure 17.2

Section D – Parking stress survey summary

This section provides a summary of the parking survey conducted on a weekday (Thursday 4 November 2010) and a Saturday (6 November 2010).

The beat survey was carried out at every hour from 0700 to 1800. No major public events, school holidays or transport problems were reported on these dates. Full details of the results are set out in appendix 5.1 and 5.2. The weekday maximum parking occupancy is summarised in figure 18 and figure 19 and also indicates the time when the peak occurred.

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

The whole survey area (\approx 8.66 km kerbside) was surveyed between 0700 and 1800. The first beat in reality starts at 0600 and the last finished at 1900.

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

Headline results (LG)

- 1) All six roads demonstrated very high (>80%) peaks in parking occupancy. The average peak weekday occupancy was 86%. Three roads showed oversaturation (>100%) indicating parking was occurring in unsafe locations (on road junctions or yellow lines) or in obstructive locations (across dropped kerbs).
- 2) The highest level of occupancy (106%) was recorded on the weekday at 1100 in Maude Road.
- 3) The lowest level of occupancy (33%) was recorded on the Saturday at 1800 in Grace's Mews (excepting Camberwell Church Street which has no parking availability).
- 4) All roads showed a higher maximum occupancy on the weekday than the Saturday.
- 5) The average amount of weekday "commuter" or "non-resident" parking was 26% (excluding Camberwell Church Street which has no parking availability).
- 6) Vestry Road showed the highest peak proportion (37%) of weekday "commuter" or "non-resident" parking. The lowest proportion (20%) was in Wilson Road.

Headline results (SW)

- 7) Six of the ten roads demonstrated very high (>80%) peaks in parking occupancy. The average peak weekday occupancy was 79%. Four roads showed oversaturation (>100%) indicating parking was occurring in unsafe locations (on road junctions or yellow lines) or in obstructive locations (across dropped kerbs).
- 8) The highest level of occupancy (133%) was recorded on the weekday at 0800 in Cottage Green.

- 9) The lowest level of occupancy (8%) was recorded on the Saturday at 1300 and 1700 in Newent Close.
- 10) All roads showed a higher maximum occupancy on the weekday than the Saturday.
- 11) The average amount of weekday “commuter” or “non-resident” parking was 26%.
- 12) Southampton Way showed the highest peak proportion (43% on weekday 44% on Saturday) of “commuter” or “non-resident parking”. These figures exclude Newent Close, Cottage Green and Sedgemore Place due to the very low number of parking spaces available or included within the survey.

Lucas Gardens Parking Max Occupancy

Network development

Thurs 4 Nov 2010





Figure 19

Southampton Way Parking Max Occupancy



Network development

Thurs 4 Nov 2010



LEGEND

Consultation area

Maximum occupancy (%) Thursday
(time max occ occurs)

- 100 to 134% (11)
- 80 to 100% (9)
- 50 to 80% (1)
- 0 to 50% (3)

© Crown copyright. All rights reserved (00100019252) 2009

Section E – Study conclusions and recommendations

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

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

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

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

Consideration has been given to those views expressed by alternative methods to the Freepost questionnaire. Whilst they have not been added to the results for reasons discussed on page (28) it was important to check that there was no significant contrast of opinion between questionnaire responses and emailed comments. As there were relatively few pieces of additional correspondence, no discernable difference is evident.

Consultation results show a clear correlation between support for the CPZ and perceived easy/difficulty in parking. Those supporting the introduction of a CPZ report difficulty parking in their street, 54.2% of CPZ supporters said that they found parking difficult (≥ 4 on scale of 1(easy) to 5(difficult)). The converse is equally true and those against the introduction of a CPZ who reported little difficulty parking in their street. 32.8% of those against the CPZ found parking easy (≤ 2 on scale of 1(easy) to 5(difficult)).

Each individual response was mapped in GIS which provided opportunity to look for patterns beyond that displayed on a street level (Figure 5 and 13); i.e. to identify if support was clustered at one end of a road, etc. Patterns were identified in the northern half of Southampton Way, discussed below.

Options - LG

- 1) Approve the CPZ in LG in all streets consulted.
- 2) Approve the CPZ in LG in only those streets with clear support (shown in Figure 5). This would exclude Vestry Road and Grace's Mews from the CPZ.

Options - SW

- 3) Approve CPZ in SW in all streets consulted.
- 4) Approve CPZ in SW in those streets with support (shown in Figure 13). This would exclude Coleman Road, Southampton Way and Rainbow Street.
- 5) Approve extension of East Camberwell (EC) CPZ to include northern section of Southampton Way (Wells Way to New Church Street), Parkhouse Street, Cottage Green and Wells Way (Parkhouse Street to St George's Way). This option recognises the cluster of support for the CPZ in the northern half of Southampton Way (including Chiswell Street) and is based upon need for a logical boundary. This option excludes two streets that showed support for the CPZ (Dowlas Street and Bonsor Street)
- 6) Do not approve the implementation of a CPZ in Coleman Road, Rainbow Street, Dowlas Road, Bonsor Street or the southern section of Southampton Way (south of Wells Way) but do make minor adjustments to those street to prevent parking on junctions and install a new car club bay in Rainbow Street.

In view of the consultation results and taking account of correspondence received outside of the questionnaire and the need to provide a logical CPZ boundary (as far as possible) it is recommended that the council precede to statutory consultation in Lucas Gardens and the northern section of the Southampton Way area, as outlined in options 1, 5 and 6.

Whilst the consultation in Dowlas Street and Bonsor Street showed support for the CPZ, the introduction of a CPZ into such a small area with interconnected, uncontrolled streets would lead to immediate displacement and a perceived failure of the newly introduced CPZ.

Should option 5 be accepted it is recommended option 6 is implemented to improve sight lines, improve road safety for all road users including pedestrians and traffic flow especially for refuse and emergency vehicles. The Southwark car club scheme has proved very successful and each bay has been shown to result in the removal of 25 private vehicles from the road network.

Taking into consideration all aspects of the report, it is recommended that options 1, 5 and 6 are carried out by the council.

List of appendices

1. Borough and beyond CPZ map
2. LG consultation document
3. SW consultation document
4. LG and SW Consultation Street notices
- 5.1 LG and SW (weekday) occupancy survey
- 5.2 LG and SW (Saturday) occupancy survey
6. OS land use map

Version control

Version 1.0 FINAL

Author: Michael Herd

Checked by: Tim Walker

Approved by: Tim Walker