

APPENDIX 1

Date	Name, Address	Objection	Officers Response
25/05/2011 Landells Road	Why no humps are proposed in Landells Road	If further CGS funds are available an application will be considered.
25/05/2011 Matham Grove, London	Object to hump being placed out side their house. This is waste of Public money at the time of financial difficulties. Object on grounds of noise Object on grounds of increased pollution	The funds were approved bu Dulwich Community Council The humps will be constructed in accordance with the Dft guidelines. It is not expected to increase noise or pollution.
25/05/2011 Upland Road London	Object to the extent of the proposals and the method of traffic calming	Traffic calming will be achieved with sinusoidal humps in accordance with the DfT recommendations. It is Council's policy to reduce speeds to 20 mph on all of its roads.
26/05/2011 Matham Grove	Matham Grove has no speeding problems. This would be wasteful of funds, be disruptive and increase parking problems for residents.	There was a CGS Application for Matham Grove component, followed after a 30 person Matham Grove resident petition. There was a majority in favour of the traffic calming 53.33% supported the humps and 86.66% supported the speed limit. The humps will not reduce any parking for the residents.

East Dulwich Area - Proposed 20 mph speed limits.

Ref. No: PR/ND/RDH/TMO1112-01

25th May 2011

previously sent my objections to this proposal to sharada.kalakhetti@southwark.gov.uk on the 25th September 2010.

We signed in favour of Road Humps when Gregor, a neighbour, came to the door with his petition but have now had time to reconsider and we now oppose the idea.

I object to a hump being placed outside my house on the grounds that it is an outrageous waste of public money at a time when the country has financial difficulties:-

I've lived at this address for 27 years and the only accidents I know of are the two relating to vehicle damage claimed by Gregor, the organizer of the hump petition. Humps are not necessary. Speed isn't an issue in this street. The installation would be an outrageous waste of public money!

I object to a hump being placed outside my house on the grounds of noise:-

Although the residents of Derwent Grove are not unduly bothered by the humps, their gardens are deeper and they don't have as many delivery lorries and vans etc as we do servicing the shops of Lordship Lane. (The No Right Turn at the junction of East Dulwich Grove and Lordship Lane forces traffic down our street heading towards Forest Hill) My front window is just over 3m from the curb. I know for a fact that heavier vehicles shake/vibrate the windows of my house and the contents of delivery vehicles cause rattle and general noise. My evidence for this is the fact that we have had to put up with pot-holes outside number 8 and 10 for many years. The noise was so annoying that I reported them for repair over 5 or 6 times in the last 3-4 years.

Recently our street has been resurfaced and the difference is enormous. I don't want the risk of being returned to the constant rattle and noise from vehicles caused by the humps.

I object to a hump being placed outside my house on the grounds of increased pollution:-

When driving, one generally accelerates away from a hump. Watch others or analyze your own driving. This will undoubtedly cause more pollution directly outside and inside my house. Having the original sash windows I know that the pollution caused by car exhaust and even shopkeepers who used to smoke outside my house can be detected in the house.

Finally, if you insist on placing humps in Matham Grove please place the last hump, currently at the boundary of 6 and 8, outside the house of someone who supports the idea.

.....
.... Matham Grove
.....

From: [mailto:.....@talktalk.net]

Sent: 25 May 2011 20:21

To: traffic orders

Subject: Ref PR/ND/RDH/TM01112-001

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to register both my support and my concerns re: building speed bumps and the proposed use of 20mph speed limits in the East Dulwich area. I live at Landells Road and have lived in this house for the last 5-6 years. I whole heartedly support the proposals regarding the enforcement of the 20 mph speed limit on Landells Road. Cars travel at great speed up and down our road causing a great deal of noise and pollution and put pedestrians at an increased risk of fatal accident as a result of their speed. The speed that some cars reach on our road is truly astounding. We have two children who are 2 and 3.5 and I am very worried for their safety. Although I support your proposals I am also concerned that the limit will not be enforced. How do you propose to enforce the limit because without speed cameras or a police man standing guard on the street there is NO WAY cars will slow down.

I note that you are proposing to put in speed humps on 3 roads Ashbourne, Matham and Chesterfield. Why just 3 roads? Why those roads? And why not Landells Road? Landells Road is very long and gives cars the opportunity to gather great speed in a way which is not seen on the other roads. Landells is used as a rat run and cut through from Lordship Lane to The Rye in a way that the other three roads are not. Additionally, because Crystal Palace Road has speed bumps, car users dash up Landells road (which runs parallel) to avoid the bumps on Crystal Palace Road.

Please, please, please re-consider and build speed humps along the entire length of Landells Road.

Many Thanks

.....

PS On a positive note – the re-surfacing of the road last year has been a great plus. Thanks!
Now, what about the pavements!!

Upland Road
East Dulwich
London SE22 0DG

25th May 2011

PO Box 64529
SE1P 5LX

Dear Sirs
Your Ref: PR/ND/RDH/TMO 1112-001 (East Dulwich No. 2)

I wish to formally object to the proposals advertised for one or more of the following reasons:

I do not object to the provision of 20mph limits in some streets where appropriate. However the extent of the proposals and the methods of traffic calming are not appropriate for the area.

1. The use of road humps causes noise, vibration, pollution and possible property damage, particularly with heavy vehicles.
2. Road humps cause drivers to go slow-fast-slow thereby increasing noise and fuel consumption increasing pollution.
3. It is not necessary to have traffic calming measures in any street shorter than 50 metres as drivers cannot accelerate in this length.
4. Traffic calming should be limited to only those streets where there is a measured and proven speed problem. Such measurements are not available.
5. It is not necessary to have a reduction in speed limit to 20mph if traffic calming is introduced in the problem roads.
6. Road humps are unsightly and downgrade the visual environment. The Council should rather be seeking to improve the environment of East Dulwich.
7. More environmentally acceptable alternatives to road humps are available. For example: tables at road junctions; chicanes; strategically placed parking bays; strategically placed shrub planting. Although more costly this would be the same total cost if some of the reductions suggested above are undertaken.
8. There has been no carbon impact assessment of the proposal. This is likely to be high due to the speed reductions and increased fuel consumptions in the area. It would make a negative contribution to the government's declared target of halving carbon emissions by 2025.
9. Some boroughs (eg Croydon, Barnet, Sheffield) have removed humps due to waning public support. The reasons for this should be investigated and made known to residents before any further humps are introduced.

Please note this is a substantive objection and can only be withdrawn by me in writing. It cannot be considered to be withdrawn simply after any phone conversation.

MATHAM GROVE TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES

Help us to help you!

Please complete this questionnaire and tick the boxes as appropriate.

Give us your views!

1. Do you support the proposal for speed humps in Matham Grove? Yes No No opinion
2. Would you support a 20 mph speed limit in Matham Grove? Yes No No opinion
3. Are you a resident or business? Resident Business

4. **Additional comments and suggestions**—As Matham Grove has no speeding problems this would be wasteful of funds, be disruptive, increase parking problems for residents. A resident of 50 years, I can reassure you the road itself acts as a speed limiter. The two sections join by the corner bend are too short in length to accommodate speed. Cars are slow moving upon entry having stopped or slowed down to enter, only to then need to carefully negotiate the corner bend as they turn to park or continue at no increase in speed to junction. I often walk in the road as I know vehicles are few and the speed is limited by the design of the road.
Please do not forget to fill in your details

Name Date

Address Postcode

(PTO)

Should you require any further information regarding the proposed scheme please do not hesitate to contact Sharada Kalakheti on 0207 525 5556. Alternatively you can email to: sharada.kalakheti@southwark.gov.uk.

APPENDIX 3

The tables below report the level of response and the general level of support for the measures outlined in the consultation exercise. Only the responses received on completed questionnaires and emails from residents and businesses of the project area have been considered. Responses received from Southwark in-house and statutory consultees have not been considered for statistical calculations. Their particular queries, if applicable, were responded separately.

Matham Grove

Total number of letters sent to residents	65
Total number of letters sent to statutory consultees (not considered for statistical calculations)	16
Total number of letters sent to Southwark in-house statutory consultees (not considered for statistical calculations)	22
Number of completed questionnaires returned	14 (21.54 %)
Number of responses received by email and letters	1 (1.54 %)
Number of responses from residents	14 (21.54 %)
Number of responses from businesses	1 (1.54 %)
Number in support to the proposal of the speed humps	8 (53.33 %)
Number in opposition to the proposal of speed humps	7(46.67 %)
Number with no opinion to the proposal of speed humps	0 (0.00 %)
Number in support to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	13(86.66 %)
Number in opposition to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	1 (6.67 %)
Number with no opinion to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	1 (6.67 %)

Consultation responses were returned from 15 residents and businesses, of which 53.33% have supported the proposal of implementation of speed humps and 86.66% have supported the proposal of implementation of 20 mph speed limit.

Ashbourne Grove

Total number of letters sent to residents	99
Total number of letters sent to statutory consultees (not considered for statistical calculations)	16
Total number of letters sent to Southwark in-house statutory consultees (not considered for statistical calculations)	22
Number of completed questionnaires returned	21 (21.21 %)
Number of responses received by email and letters	1 (1.01 %)
Number of responses from residents	21(95.45 %)
Number of responses from businesses	1 (4.55 %)
Number in support to the proposal of the speed humps	13 (59.09 %)
Number in opposition to the proposal of speed humps	8(36.36 %)
Number with no opinion to the proposal of speed humps	1 (4.55 %)
Number in support to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	19(86.36 %)
Number in opposition to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	2 (9.09 %)
Number with no opinion to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	1 (4.55 %)

Consultation responses were returned from 22 residents and businesses, of which 59.09% have supported the proposal of implementation of speed humps and 86.36% have supported the proposal of implementation of 20 mph speed limit.

Chesterfield Grove

Total number of letters sent to residents	81
Total number of letters sent to statutory consultees (not considered for statistical calculations)	16
Total number of letters sent to Southwark in-house statutory consultees (not considered for statistical calculations)	22
Number of completed questionnaires returned	28 (34.57 %)
Number of responses received by email and letters	0 (0.00 %)
Number of responses from residents	27(96.43 %)
Number of responses from businesses	1 (3.57 %)
Number in support to the proposal of the speed humps	16 (57.14 %)
Number in opposition to the proposal of speed humps	12(42.86 %)
Number with no opinion to the proposal of speed humps	0 (0.00 %)
Number in support to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	24(85.71 %)
Number in opposition to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	4 (14.29 %)
Number with no opinion to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	0 (0.00 %)

Consultation responses were returned from 28 residents and businesses, of which 57.14% have supported the proposal of implementation of speed humps and 85.71% have supported the proposal of implementation of 20 mph speed limit.

Bassano Street and Blackwater Street

Total number of letters sent to residents	131
Total number of letters sent to statutory consultees (not considered for statistical calculations)	16
Total number of letters sent to Southwark in-house statutory consultees (not considered for statistical calculations)	22
Number of completed questionnaires returned	23 (21.21 %)
Number of responses received by email and letters	2 (1.01 %)
Number of responses from residents	21(84.00 %)
Number of responses from businesses	4 (16.00 %)
Number in support to the proposal of the speed humps	10 (40.00 %)
Number in opposition to the proposal of speed humps	14(56.00 %)
Number with no opinion to the proposal of speed humps	1 (4.00 %)
Number in support to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	21(84.00 %)
Number in opposition to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	3 (12.00 %)
Number with no opinion to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	1 (4.00 %)

Consultation responses were returned from 25 residents and businesses, of which only 40.00% have supported the proposal of implementation of speed humps and 84.00% have supported the proposal of implementation of 20 mph speed limit.

East Dulwich 20 mph speed limit

Number of questionnaires returned	100	-
No. of responses from residents	95	(95 %)
No. of responses from businesses	3	(3 %)
No. in support of the scheme	82	(82%)
No. in opposition to the scheme	16	(16 %)
No opinion	2	(2 %)

Consultation responses were returned from 100 of the residents and businesses out of 3057 (3.3% response rate), of which 82% supported the scheme and 16% opposed the proposals.